



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 07077956 0







*3369*  
**A REPORT**

OF THE

**PROCEEDINGS AT A MEETING**

OF THE

**Cork Reformation Society,**

HELD AT

WESLEY CHAPEL, PATRICK-STREET CORK,

ON THE 10th. & 11th. OF JANUARY, 1828.

---

PUBLISHED BY DIRECTION OF THE COMMITTEE.

---

**Cork:**

PRINTED BY E. PURCELL & SON, PATRICK-STREET.

SOLD AT THE RELIGIOUS TRACT DEPOSITORY,  
SOCIETY HOUSE, 9, GRAND-PARADE.

1828.

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY  
95287  
ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.  
1898

## REPORT &c.

A SOCIETY designed to promote the principles of the REFORMATION, having been formed in Cork in the Spring of 1827 — and a deputation consisting of Captain Vernon, R. N. and Captain Gordon, having been sent to this country by the Metropolitan Society of Great Britain, with the same object — it was proposed that the Cork Society should unite with that in London — whereupon a Meeting was held on the 10th January, 1828. and continued by adjournment till the following day, to consider the propriety of becoming Auxiliary to the British Society — the REV. WILLIAM LEWIS BEAUFORT, Son-in-Law to the LORD BISHOP OF CORK, was unanimously called to the Chair, and addressed the Meeting as follows. —

MY Friends and Fellow Citizens, it is not without feelings of unfeigned regret and reluctance that I find myself occupying this station among you, at a meeting convened for purposes so important, so deeply interesting and so distinguished in point of numbers and respectability. I should have sincerely wished to see this post occupied by a more suitable person than the inexperienced and obscure individual to whose lot it has devolved, but the call has arisen from a concurrence of untoward circumstances. The head of the Church in this city, though participating warmly in the object in view, and uniting with his whole heart in the benevolent purpose of the society, is unfortunately disabled by the heavy pressure of indisposition from taking any active part in the proceedings, and I have his instructions to say, that though it has not been in his power to bestow that minute attention which at another time his sense of duty would demand, and for which his clear and correct judgment might be well qualified upon the policy of the measures to be adopted, the design itself has his warm and his hearty approbation.

The learned and excellent Bishop of the adjoining Diocese has also been pleased to signify his concurrence and promise of support, though he too has been withheld by obstacles from giving us the countenance of his presence in this chair; while we are in like manner deprived by other intervening difficulties, of our brethren, the inferior dignitaries



of the church in this city. And the kind and ready acquiescence of a noble lay Lord, vice-president of the Society above,—who is ever ready at the public call to assist in advancing the interests of his country—ever anxious for the improvement of the people—has been unfortunately frustrated by a visitation of severe domestic affliction. Under these circumstances, depending on your indulgence to my deficiencies, and knowing myself possessed of one qualification for the post, a deep interest in the cause and ardent wishes for its success, and knowing that the weakest instruments in the hand of HIM who disposeth of all things, are sufficient for the accomplishment of the mightiest designs, I have only to request your assistance and support, whilst I endeavour to discharge the duties of the office that has devolved upon me.

The object which has brought us together this day is briefly this.—In the month of May last a Society was formed in the metropolis of this Empire, comprehending within it a very large portion of the most distinguished in the community, both lay and ecclesiastic, whose avowed purpose is to aid and promote the reformation of Religion among persons professing the Roman Catholic Creed, and whose design is, to effect that important purpose by facilitating the acquisition of Scriptural knowledge and thence imparting to men spiritual light and wisdom, (Prov. iv. 7. 13.) “Wisdom” says the royal Preacher “is the principal thing, therefore get wisdom, and with all thy getting get understanding; exalt her and she shall promote thee to honour;—let her not go, keep her for she is thy life.” Similar in its object and co operation in principle and plan, a native Society has more recently been instituted in our own capital, under the high and encouraging sanction of the learned Arch-bishop of that see; and many country Towns have established auxiliary branches of this Christian Association, in order by a more local application of the means provided, to further more universally the benevolent design; whilst in our own City an Association was formed several months ago, alike in principle; and aiming at the same object by similar means.—The point then which is to be proposed to-day for the consideration of the assembled members of this local Association, is the propriety of uniting themselves with the Metropolitan Society, and by the adoption of resolutions, corresponding in object, in principle, and in plan, constituting them-

selves a branch of it. The subject for your consideration, is the expediency of the measure that we propose to you, and how far you will be induced by approbation of the statements which you will hear, to give us your patronage and your support in furthering and promoting this laudable object. You will hear detailed from the lips of the eloquent gentlemen around me, the principles, the object and the plan of the society, and for them I do confess that I do confidently anticipate your concurrence and warmly hope for your effective co-operation.

I shall first however shortly advert to them in a general way, in the hope that a simple view of the Society's fundamental rules, may serve to disarm in every reasonable bosom, the spirit of prejudiced hostility. The *principle* by which the Society is actuated is no other than the principle of the Christian,—of obedience to our common Lord, in doing good one to another: it is a principle of love which strives to benefit all our fellow creatures, without regard to their creeds, not only in the passing concerns of the perishable body, but yet more in the ever during interests of the everlasting spirit. The *object* of the Society is one which can scarcely excite censure, It is to give to those that want—it is to bestow treasure invaluable on those that stand in need of it,—treasure that can never be exhausted—the treasure of the spirit, the light of knowledge concerning their eternal interests. It is to renew and replenish the stores which may have been exhausted by lapse of time, or may have been corrupted perhaps by misuse. All human things are subject to decay, and require renovation; all earthly things are perishable, but in the hands of the all-wise Creator of the Universe they are regularly renewed by periodical revolution, and in all the inferior parts of the creation, through his supreme ordinances, decay leads to reproduction. *Man alone—man*, designed to survive the limits of time—intellectual, spiritual man, is exempt from this absolute control, and permitted to guide himself. The mind of man, endowed with free will, is granted to him for his guidance. The mind of man is allowed by the use of that freedom of will to provide by its own exertion for its own preservation, supported indeed by the promise of divine assistance to aid the weakness of his efforts, but subject to a heavy responsibility, with all its awful consequences, for the use to which that freedom of will shall be turned, and for the decision to which it

may lead with regard to the acceptance or rejection of those gracious offers of aid from above, without which, such is the frailty of human nature, that all our most strenuous efforts are insufficient and our best resolutions unstable. All human institutions therefore, all institutions passing through the hands of man, partaking of the frailty of the original from which they emanate, and infected by the medium through which they pass, do in the lapse of time suffer deterioration, corruption and perversion. All therefore require *reformation*.

The truth of this position is evinced with regard to secular affairs by the revolutions which have taken place in human Governments, during all the periods of the world, and the outcry which we daily hear among ourselves for reform in all departments of the state, whether civil or legislative, proves that it is acknowledged even now.

Surely they who cry out with so much zeal for reformation in matters which are but temporary in their duration, and which can at most concern but the perishable objects of this fleeting, this evanescent world, can with no consistency condemn the application of the same principal to matters affecting our welfare during the never ending time, or deny the necessity of reforming and eradicating errors which regard our interests, in that spiritual state of being in which our keenest perceptions will be called into action, and which will never conclude. Reformation therefore in spiritual concerns is rendered necessary by the frailty of man, equally as in his temporary and passing interests, and accordingly for such spiritual reformation in religious belief and practice, we have the highest possible sanction and we are not without examples the most authoritative. Was not the deliverance of Israel from bondage and from the idolatry of Egypt a great reformation of the sinking religion of the people? Was not that a reformation when they were taught by Moses to know their God, when Moses refreshed in their hearts the love of God, when he gave them a new standard of right, and a new law in delivering to them the written word of revelation? Was not that a *signal* reformation which was effected by the good king Joshua when he read to all the people, profane and idolatrous the book of the word of God long lost—dispersed—forgotten—but found by the High Priest under the dust of years in the Temple of the Lord—when he thus reclaimed the people from their licentiousness,

and revived in their hearts the law of the living God? Was not that a most distinguished religious reformation which was introduced by the SON of the Most High God himself, when he expounded to the people the true and spiritual purpose of that again misapplied and misinterpreted Law, when he rebuked the chief priests and the rulers for their vain worship, perverting as they did the law through ignorance of the Scriptures—making the commandments of God of none effect by their traditions and teaching for Doctrines the commandments of men. When declaring the end and purpose of the Jewish establishment to be fulfilled and accomplished in his person, he abrogated institutions which had existed for above a thousand years, and superseding them by a new and more perfect order of things, he put an end to an establishment which had been received by generation after generation, with all the fond tenacity of national partiality, and religious affection.

Such is the object which the Society proposes, such the *spiritual* reformation which they have in view. It is to bring back the minds of men to the knowledge of that true and only rule—THE SCRIPTURES OF GOD'S HOLY WORD; it is to reform abuses, which, through human frailty, error, ignorance, the loss, as to common use, of the book of Truth, have crept into the bosom of Christ's Church during the lapse of ages to tarnish the purity of the christian faith.

Lastly, the *plan* by which the society proposes to effect this great—this pre-eminent—this deeply interesting object, consists simply in giving facility of access to that source of spiritual light and knowledge;—in setting up more distinctly within the view of all—by presenting if possible to the observation of every individual, that only true, only infallible standard which proceeding from the pen of Moses, was able to set a hedge round about the Israelites and preserve them separate from a prophane world—which in the hands of the king of Judah was capable of reforming and reclaiming the people from licentiousness and idolatry—which in the person of our blessed Lord and Saviour, himself the WORD incarnate, was capable through him of renewing the heart of man unto salvation;—and which in times long subsequent, after being again obscure for ages under the dust of human superstition and depravity, on being once more discovered to the world, brought to light with it the life and immortality of the Gospel.

carrying consolation to the afflicted, and pouring delight and comfort into the bosom of every needy sufferer who faithfully received it.

This is the instrument which the society proposes to make use of—this is the sword of our warfare “Books,” to use the significant expression of an acute writer amongst ourselves, late of the Roman Catholic Communion, “books are the Apostles of this age, but of all books the Holy Scriptures of the word of God are the only standard of faith.”

Yes, the word of God it is most true as we learn from far higher authority, (Heb. 4. 12.) “The word of God is quick,”—it is living (Is. 40. 8.) “the word of our God shall stand fast for ever;”—“it is powerful and sharper than any two edged sword and piercing, even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, discerning the thoughts and intents of the heart,” and capable of disentangling and unravelling the intricacies and delusions of the deceitful heart of man, and the lusts of the flesh. This is the only instrument that the society proposes to use—this is our sword—our only sword—(2. Cor. x. 4.) for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal—but yet “mighty through God even to the pulling down of strong holds.”

No other motive is to be made use of, no secular motive is to be resorted to, no prospect of any temporal benefit, comfort, or advantage as to the concerns of this world, save that which the blessing of God bestows on the faithful and humble heart. No bribe, no threat or denunciation of pains temporal or eternal, to intimidate, no artifice to cajole even into the acceptance of this sacred and invaluable rule. It is no system of proselytism; proselytism according to its common acceptance we abhor. We abhor the notion of suffering worldly motives to tamper with religious principles or practice, and I solemnly assure you that I could by no means answer it to my conscience to sit in this place and co-operate, nor, I will boldly venture to affirm, would any one of the respected and Reverend gentlemen around me lend their countenance to promote any scheme in which such interference was in the remotest degree contemplated. But the glory of man is his free and independent intellect; it is his privilege, his unalienable privilege, and power, and right, to communicate through the spirit with his God, in no other intervention than that of the one only Mediator, *himself*

*God*, is the high prerogative which distinguishes man from every other work of this sublunary creation: on the right use of these pre-eminent endowments depends the happiness of man in time and in eternity; for the right use of this great gift man will be responsible,—for this will every man individually, and in his own person, be called to answer before the tribunal of the great Judge, where there is no respect of persons. To enable every man therefore, to vindicate the freedom of those exalted powers, which were bestowed on him by his Creator, to furnish him with the best assistance and guide to the proper and profitable use of them, with the only infallible—only trust-worthy—only safe guide, we hold it to be the greatest and most eminent service that man can render unto man. Such is the boon which the Society is desirous of bestowing on their countrymen; it is one which is especially called for at this period of the world, when the spirit of the times indicates its necessity, in the ardent desire which we see diffusing itself among the minds of men, for the attainment of knowledge; the thirst for spiritual knowledge above all, which has created such a fermentation in men's minds, as to have already burst forth in various instances, through all the trammels and restraints that have been imposed by those whose constant endeavour it is, to fetter the human understanding; restraints, which efforts the most vigorous, are at this moment labouring to strengthen and redouble.

This is the object, this the plan, and such the principles of the society, to which you are now called on to lend your countenance, and to give your co-operation. May the Providence of God bless their endeavours with success, enabling them to sow the seed of the divine word in the hearts of their fellow countrymen; 'till "the earth be filled with the knowledge of the Glory of the Lord, even as the waters cover the sea (Hab. II. 14.)

The secretary of the Metropolitan Society will now read to you the rules that have been adopted for the regulation of their proceedings and if their be any person present duly qualified by attainments or respectability of station, who may desire to offer his observations on any thing that he shall hear, he shall in courtesy be attended to, although not a member of the society, but under these provisons.—That his language be decorous, and such as becomes the situation and

the subject on which he speaks—that he avoid personality, and irrelevant matter, and above all, that he abstain from political subjects or allusions; it can scarcely be necessary to caution the Reverend friends who surround me, against the use of language even apparently at variance with the spirit of christian love, or to intreat they may not suffer themselves to be betrayed by any warmth of feeling into expressions which have even the sound of asperity or vituperation.

Before the Rev. Chairman sat down he again stated the regulations by which the Meeting was to be governed; adding to the above the following two,—

That no speaker shall exceed more than three quarters of an hour, and two speakers shall not be permitted to follow on the same side.

Every speaker shall be amenable to the chair.

That the Meeting break up at Four o'Clock precisely.—

CAPTAIN GORDON, SECRETARY TO THE BRITISH REFORMATION SOCIETY then came forward and said:—

Before Sir, I read the Resolution which has been put into my hands, I think it due to this Meeting to express my sincere regret, that those who represent the British Reformation Society, have not been able to secure the assistance which they had expected, on the present important occasion. We did hope Sir, that one or two distinguished individuals from the Metropolis, would have aided our efforts this day, but circumstances over which they have no control have occurred to prevent their attendance. The resolution which I have the honour to propose is as follows;—

That approving of the object and the proceedings of the British Reformation Society, this Society becomes Auxiliary to it, and be henceforth designated "*The Cork Auxiliary to the British Society, for promoting the Religious principles of the Reformation.*"

This Sir is the resolution which has been committed to me, and I trust it is one which this respectable meeting will approve and adopt, when they become acquainted with the character of the institution to which it refers.

The object Sir, of the Society which I have the honour to represent is stated in its designation. It is to promote the *religious* principles

of the Reformation, to extend the influence of that mighty revolution, which emancipated so large a portion of Europe from the yoke of a Spiritual despotism. If it be demanded of me, that I should state what these principles are, I answer, that they are justification by faith, through the atoning blood and meritorious righteousness of a Crucified Redeemer; coupled with regeneration of heart, and sanctification of life, by the spirit of the living God:

These Sir, are the religious principles of the Reformation, and I speak confidently, when I say, that they are principles to which every Scripturally instructed Protestant will subscribe. The plan by which the Society proposes to carry its object into effect, is holding up to the understanding of the Nation the contrast which exists between the principles of Scripture, and the doctrines of the Church of Rome. It is in other words, to contrast the doctrines of the Council of Trent with the Religion of the New Testament, and to encourage an appeal to the law and to the testimony, on every subject connected with a sinner's salvation. In this important and sacred undertaking, the Society so far from wishing to repress discussion, has adopted the most likely method of promoting it, and on every such occasion as the present, will be happy to hear the objections of any person who may dissent from the principles which have been stated, provided he submits to the rules that are laid down for the regulation of the discussion. I shall now read from the printed circular of the British Reformation Society the plan of operation which it has laid down as the practical groundwork of the system.

#### PLAN OF OPERATION.

The Society proposes:—

1st. To assist Clergymen, and others engaged in promoting the Reformation to purchase (when they cannot be gratuitously obtained) such quantities of Bibles, Testaments, and Religious Tracts as may be necessary to meet the encreasing wants of their respective parishes and districts.

2nd. To supply individuals and branch Associations with the means of adapting useful instruction to the local peculiarities of their



respective districts, by the publication of important controversy, pastoral addresses, interesting correspondence, and affidavits, or other forms of testimony, in answer to misstatements demanding refutation.

3d. To defray the expense of controversial meetings, and the publication of their proceedings.

4th. To collect and circulate through Great Britain, authentic intelligence respecting the moral condition of Ireland, and the progress of the Reformation.

5th. To adopt every practicable mode of disseminating the religious principles of the Reformation, among Roman Catholics in other parts of the British Empire.

6th. In the full spirit of the foregoing design, the Society disclaims all connexion with politics, and will hold forth no secular inducement to proselytism.

The plan which has been presented, embraces the twofold object of aiding the exertions of established societies, and providing the additional means which are wanting to enable individuals and local associations to adapt instruction to the present state of the Roman Catholic population. From the above statement, the public must perceive that the British Reformation Society, will hold out no temporal inducement to Roman Catholics in the accomplishment of its objects. It must be equally obvious, that the views of the Directors, are entirely unconnected with politics.—Their aim, is to combine the diffusion of religious truth with the means of its vindication, and to leave the result in hands of Him, who said, "My word shall not return unto me void." In this solemnly important undertaking, they desire to persuade their Roman Catholic brethren by their practice as well as their professions that in exposing what they consider the pernicious errors of the Roman Catholic religion, they are influenced solely by the interest which they feel for the present and eternal welfare of its professors, and by a humble desire to promote the glory of God. Mr. Gordon entered into a particular explanation of each head of this statement, and pointed out its practical bearing upon the objects and prospects of the Reformation.

He then continued. Such, Sir, are the objects and plan of the British Society, for promoting the religious principles of the Reformation.

mation, and if we view them in connexion with the operation of existing Institutions, we shall find that they will harmonise with, and stimulate the whole system of Scriptural instruction in this country. The Reformation Society, will assist the operations of every established Institution, and supply at the same time, whatever was wanting, to adapt instruction to the existing circumstances of the country. Every Association which it forms will become a channel for diffusing more extensively the benefit of previously established societies, by giving publicity to their objects, and encreasing the demand for their instruction. The object of the Bible Society is simply to prepare and present the Bible to those who willingly receive it, and in the prosecution of this object, it has nothing to do with the difference between one creed and another. It is ready to bestow the Bible when it is demanded, but we must have recourse to other means, in creating the demand. There is not a clergyman or layman, Sir, within my hearing who does not know, that there are thousands, I wish I could not say millions, in this country, who believe that they are independent of the Bible for their Religion, and will even look upon the possession of it as dangerous to their salvation. It will be in vain that we offer this Bible to men who are in this situation. We know from experience that it would be instantly rejected. We must approach the understanding of such persons through the medium of the press. You must reach the intellect through various channels of controversy and conversation and local discussion on the subject of the Bible, before we can give them any just conceptions of the character of the book, or excite in their mind a suspicion that the religion they profess is opposed to the revelation which it contains. Then, and not until then, shall we create a general demand for the Bible among those who are ignorant of its existence or afraid of its touch. It is in this manner that the Reformation Society will become a valuable auxiliary to all the Societies in operation. It leaves each in possession of its own field, and without attempting to interfere with the objects of any, it will stimulate the progress of all.

An objection, Sir, has been made to the Reformation Society founded upon the supposition that the plan of proceedings which it has adopted will repel Roman Catholics from the efforts which are using to promote their conversion. This objection Sir, like every other which

I have heard urged against the Society, is at variance with experience and in answering it, we have simply to refer to the character, and spirit of the meetings, which have been held in the most Roman Catholic parts of the country. Having it in my power a short time since to attend a very respectable meeting of the Bible Society held in the town of Carlow. I was told by a gentleman well acquainted with the Roman Catholic population of the place, that there were not half a dozen persons of the persuasion present in the assembly. A meeting of the Reformation Society was held in a fortnight afterwards, and at this Meeting, not fewer than 250 Roman Catholics were present. In Carlow, we shall perhaps, find as much religious excitement as in any part of the country, but even in Carlow, the advocates of the Reformation Society were attentively listened to, by Roman Catholics, during a discussion which occupied the greater part of two days, and the meeting afterwards separated without an expression of hostility or uncharitable feeling. Another meeting of the Society, was held in Kilkenny, and there too, we were threatened with the violence of a savage and bigoted population, ready to avenge what they might consider, the slightest insult offered to their religion. On this most interesting occasion, at least 600 of these same savages attended—a discussion took place, and after listening with attention, 'till the close of the proceedings, they separated in a spirit of peace, I might adduce many more instances to prove that means such as the Society employs, will always create an interest in the minds of Roman Catholics. They are anxious to hear what can be said upon the subject of the differences between the two Churches, and I have no hesitation in affirming, that the meetings, and the proceedings which promise to afford most information on these subjects, will be most numerous attended. But as it is objected to the Society, that it is calculated to repel Roman Catholics, so it is asserted, that it is admirably fitted to congregate *political* Protestants—when I say political Protestants, I mean the description of persons who are extremely alive upon the subject of *political* Protestantism, without manifesting any corresponding anxiety, about the religious interests of Protestantism. For such Protestants as these the Reformation Society has no attractions, and I am not aware that we have beheld the countenance of one such, at any of our meetings.

on the contrary, we have on several occasions, experienced their decided hostility.

Those Protestants who trace their Protestantism to the Bible as its source, are the only persons who have come forward, or are likely to come forward, in support of an attempt to impart the religious blessings of the Reformation to others.

Another objection, and the only one that I feel called upon to notice is, that the Society although it may be pursuing a right end, is pursuing that end by objectionable means; controversy, we are told, is not the way to forward the interests of religious truth, and the advocates of the Reformation Society are lectured from such texts. "The Servants of God should be gentle and not strive." The Bible is appealed to on the subject, and we are told, that controversy while it is calculated to excite and influence the human passions, is not the way to open the understanding to the influence of christian truth. I would recal to the recollection of this class of objections, the means by which under Providence, our ancestors were emancipated from the yoke of the Church of Rome. I would recal to their recollection the practice of our Cranmers, our Ridleys, our Latimers, our Hoopers and others, who won the Crown of Martyrdom through controversy; what, Sir, is the Bible itself, but a system of controversy, from its opening to its close. There is not a part of the inspired volume that does not controvert and condemn the errors, the prejudices, and the misconceptions of those to whom it was addressed.—throughout the Old Testament, it is in substance or in words, "Son of Man, shew the House of Jacob their sins, and Israel their transgressions." And did the PRINCE OF PEACE when he visited our world, prove by his personal example, that his followers were to abstain from controversy? Did he not on the contrary, combat publicly the errors of the Jewish people? Did he not charge them with making void the Word of God by their traditions? — did he not controvert, and condemn the errors of the Pharisees, the Saducees, the Scribes, and the Lawyers? we find him not only proclaiming the Gospel which he was commissioned to preach, but contrasting the Gospel with the errors of those to whom he was declaring it. And what I ask was the practice of his Disciples who succeeded him, and who as they were under the influence of the Holy

Spirit, could not have mistaken the right mode of addressing their hearers. Does St. Paul, in his address to the Gallatians, content himself, with the republications of the truths which the Gallatians had originally believed? no — for we find him contrasting these truths with the opinions which had taken possession of the Church. Again we find the same Apostle holding public controversy in the Synagogues of the Jews, and disputing two whole years in the School of one Tyrannus. The message also to the Seven Churches, was a message of controversy, and in short, all the means employed in the propagation of the Gospel within the period of inspiration, were of a controversial character. I shall not, Sir, refer to other objections, because I consider that I have already noticed all that are deserving of observation; nor shall I trespass further on the time of the meeting, than merely to say, I hold myself, in readiness to answer any objection either to the principles or the proceedings of the Society, when called upon to do so. I therefore conclude with proposing the resolution which I have read. (*carried.*)

The Rev. H. NEWMAN next rose and said—Mr. Chairman we have been assembled here this day for a most important purpose, to form a Society for promoting the spiritual and eternal welfare of a large portion of our fellow countrymen, to shew them the truth—pure, unmix'd, christian truth, to shew them those errors which may endanger their everlasting peace—and to lead them to the living fountains of water, to the pure and heavenly doctrines of the blessed Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. If Sir, it is the part of true benevolence, as it assuredly is, to form Societies for promoting men's temporal welfare, and the relief of their bodily diseases, surely it is the part of the consistent believing christian who loves his fellow-creatures, to form Societies for higher purposes Societies which may tend under God to promote the everlasting peace—the everlasting happiness of their immortal souls. I am aware, Sir, that in coming forward to constitute Reformation Societies, and point out the religious differences that exists between us and our fellow-countrymen, we may be accused of illiberality and want of charity. But, Sir, let me ask, what is charity? rational charity? If we saw a fellow-creature walking on

blindfold to the verge of a dangerous precipice, would it not be charity, to tell him of his danger, though it might alarm his fears, and excite his displeasure? And if we see thousands of immortal souls walking on towards the gulf of eternity, with opinions that may be fatal to their everlasting peace, I say is it not charity, true charity, to endeavour, by every means in our power, to rescue them from their danger, and point out to them the only path of salvation through Him who is "the way, and the truth, and the life?" Surely Sir, when we look at the world around us, we see that it is a world that lieth in wickedness and sin; we see every where the dreadful effects of man's fall; we see the human race polluted, miserable, guilty and depraved. Oh! then Sir, is it not our duty to shew them, from the record of God's word, the only remedy for this widely spread disease; to shew them, from God's own word, the necessity of a radical change of heart, the necessity of a new birth unto righteousness—of faith in the Redeemer, redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins—and of sanctification by the Holy Ghost?—If man is to be saved by grace, surely we should plainly tell him, that he is to be saved by grace. We ought to declare openly in the language of the inspired Apostle, (Eph. ii. 8, 9.) "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast."

I am aware Sir, that our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, hold the doctrines of the Trinity, the Atonement, and the God-head of Christ, the operations of the Holy Ghost, and the doctrines contained in our three ancient Creeds; and for holding these truths, I honor, I respect, and love them. But, Sir, I ask, have they not covered with modern errors, the faith once delivered to the Saints? Have they not by a heap of ritual observances, and erroneous opinions, contracted in the dark ages, obscured the ancient faith? Has not the pure gold of Christian antiquity been covered with the superstitious dross of later ages? And shall we not endeavour to separate the pure ore of primitive truth from its drossy accompaniments, and shew it to our people in all its native purity and lustre? Let me now turn your attention Sir, to a few of those erroneous opinions of the Church of Rome, to which I trust this Society will be the means of attracting the observation of our fellow-countrymen. The first, Sir, to which I would refer, is the *Apocryphal*

*Books.* The Roman Catholics include some of them, in the Canon of inspired Scripture, while we reject them from it. As this subject I suspect, will be touched upon by another speaker, I shall only ask, if the Apocryphal Books were rejected by the ancient Jewish Church. If they were not included in the "Oracles of God," mentioned by St. Paul, if the Saviour of the world, or his Apostles, never quoted a single text from them; If they were not included in the catalogue of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, or acknowledged by the Council of Laodicea; if the celebrated Origen in the third century, did not hold them; if Epiphanius, Cyril, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Jerome the publisher of the Vulgate: if, in later times, Thomas Aquinas, Cardinal Zimenes, the Author of the Complutensian Bible, with Cardinal Cajetan and Erasmus, if these lights of the Church did not hold them, would not the Roman Catholic Church act wisely, if she would reform in this respect; and, with the ancient Jewish Church, and ancient Christian Church, reject the Apocryphal Books from the Canon of inspired Scripture?—The next subject I shall mention is indeed, one of a most serious and important nature; I mean *those prayers and Collects in the Roman Missal, which attribute the Salvation of man's immortal soul to the merits of his fellow man.* Sir, if there is a person here present, who felt anxious to put a mild construction on the errors of the Roman Catholic Church, it is he who now addresses you; but when I looked into the Roman Catholic Missal, and there saw in their solemn addresses to the Almighty God—when I saw in their prayers and in their collects, salvation attributed not to the merits of Christ, but to those of human beings like ourselves, I shrunk back with horror. To prove that I am not mis-stating or exaggerating, I will now read to you two collects from the Roman Catholic Missal, published in London, 1806.

"Oh God! who by innumerable miracles, hast honoured blessed Nicholas the Bishop, grant, we beseech thee, that by *his merits and intercession*, we may be delivered from eternal flames."—*Roman Missal for the Laity, published by Keating, London, 1806.*

"Oh, God! who, to recommend to us innocence of life, was pleased to let the soul of thy blessed Virgin Scholastica, ascend to heaven in the shape of a dove, grant, by *her merits* and prayers, that we may

lead innocent lives here, and ascend to eternal joys hereafter." *English Mass Book, page 556.*

Sir, I ask any respectable, worthy, sensible, Roman Catholic, is this Christianity, is this the faith once delivered to the Saints? And, Sir, if Christ has made, once for all, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, if there is but, "one mediator between God and man, *the Man Christ Jesus*," if there is "no other name under heaven given amongst men, by which they must be saved," would not the Roman Catholic Church act wisely and consistently, by beginning a Reformation in these respects, by altering her prayers and collects, and substituting for the merits of man, the merits of *Jesus Christ*? Another subject Sir, to which I will call your attention, is the doctrine of *transubstantiation*. It is well known that our Church, while she rejects the doctrine of a corporal presence in the sacrament, rejects not, but maintains, a real and spiritual presence in that blessed ordinance: that "we therein spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood—that we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; and that we feed on Christ *in our hearts by faith*." But the Church at Rome, adopts the doctrine of the literal and gross transubstantiation of the elements. Bishop Doyle, in his examination before the Commissioners of Education, declares, that the adoration which would be paid to the Host, if it should be carried in the streets, is the same that would be paid to the Almighty God himself, that it continues until the elements begin to decay; and that then the Divinity leaves it. Oh! Sir, is not this a most extraordinary and inconsistent doctrine, that the Almighty God is subject to decay—that God who is incapable of change, and whose own word declares "thou wilt not suffer thine holy one to see corruption!" Would not the Roman Catholic Church act wisely in beginning a Reformation on this point; and while they alter their doctrine of the corporal presence, maintain with us, the doctrine of the real and spiritual presence?—Another subject I would lay before you is, the doctrine of *intention*, which makes the validity of the sacrament depend on the intention of the Minister, and it follows from that, that no Roman Catholic can be certain, that he has ever been baptized, or has received any one of the seven sacra-



ments. I am aware that we are accused of misrepresentation on this subject; and therefore I shall read to the meeting, two passages from authorized publications of the Roman Catholic Church. The first, Sir, is a passage from the Roman Missal, printed by Coyne, Dublin, 1822; which is as follows:—

“If any does not intend to consecrate but to counterfeit—also if any wafers through forgetfulness remain on the altar; if any part of the wine, or any wafer be hiddden, when he did not intend to consecrate any but what he saw; also, if he shall have before him eleven wafers, and intend to consecrate but *ten* only, not determining which *ten* he meant; in all these cases he does not consecrate, because *intention* is required.” Now, Sir, if consecration does not take place, and if the Host is elevated, surely, on the ground of this passage, those who adore it, adore not the Creator, but the creature.—The next passage which I shall mention, to shew that the doctrine of intention is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, is quoted from the Council of Trent, which pronounces an anathema against those who do not believe that doctrine. “If any person shall have said, that intention is not required in the Ministers, when they make and administer the Sacrament, at least the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be accursed” (Council of Trent, Sep. 7. Can. 2.)

That I have given the true meaning of the doctrine of intention is evident, from Cardinal Bellarmine, who says, “a Sacrament is not perfect without the intention of the Minister, and no one can know the intention of another.” And Gabriel Biel says, “no priest that celebrateth can know evidently, whether he be a Priest, because he cannot know evidently, whether he be baptized or lawfully ordained.” Now, Sir, I would ask, would not the Church of Rome act wisely in reforming herself in these doctrines, and in attributing the efficacy of the Sacrament, not to the mind and intention of man, but to the mind and will of God, who alone “worketh in us, to will and to do,” and who alone can make his Sacraments a means of grace to the believer’s soul?

Another subject is the doctrine of *half-communion*, by which the laity are deprived of the Cup in the Sacrament. Oh! Sir, surely here we have antiquity, we have the true Catholic Church on our side, we

have the voice of the Church Catholic for 1200 years, with us; for it was not until the Councils of Constance and Trent, that the people were deprived of the Cup. Then, Sir, without referring to Our Saviour's words, "Drink ye *all* of this," I ask on the ground of antiquity would not the Church of Rome act wisely in beginning a reformation of this practice, by giving the Communion in both kinds—by giving the Cup to the people in the Sacrament?—*The reading of their liturgies, prayers, and collects, in a language which the people can understand*, is another subject to which I would draw their attention as an amendment. Without referring to the passages in the Epistle to the Corinthians, where the Apostle speaks of the inconsistency of praying in an unknown tongue, I would ask, on the ground of good sense and reason, if the people were to pray and praise God in a language which they understood, would it not be more consistent with the Apostle's words, "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also, I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." But Sir, to show that I am not going too far, or that I may not be accused of proselytism and an over zeal for reformation in this respect, in which I believe from my heart, that if alterations were made, real satisfaction would be afforded thereby to many excellent Roman Catholics, and that I am warranted in so saying, I shall read to the Meeting, an extract from the writings of a Roman Catholic Clergyman, the Rev. C. Eustace, who in his Classical 'Tour through Italy,' alluding to the revival of primitive discipline by the Pope, says :—

"If in reviving this part of primitive discipline, the Pope would also exercise the power which the Council of Trent has intrusted to him, and would admit, as I have hinted above, the laity to the Cup (so solemn and impressive a part of the sacred rite) and if, at the same time, he would communicate to every nation the comfort of singing the praises of God in their own language, he would render to the Church of Christ a most important and ever-memorable service."—*Rev. C. Eustace's Classical Tour through Italy, vol. 1. p. 374.*

Here Sir, we have an enlightened Clergyman, of the Church of Rome, declaring that such alterations would confer a most important and ever-memorable service on the Church of Christ.—I might also

add the authority of the celebrated Abbé Fleury, the author of "Discourses on Ecclesiastical History." He there deeply laments, the enormities, the superstitions, and corruptions, that crept into the Church, in the dark ages, exclaiming, 'at the close of the 6th century, "the good days of the Church are past." I would ask in conclusion, if the Roman Catholic Church would reject the Apocryphal Books from the Canon of their inspired Scriptures—if she would translate her prayers and collects into the language of the people—if she would substitute the merits of Christ for the merits of man—if she would reject the doctrine of a corporal presence, and maintain with us a real and spiritual presence in the sacrament—if she would reject the doctrine of intention, and attribute the efficacy of the sacrament to the intention and mind of the blessed God—if instead of half communion, she would allow communion in both kinds—would she not be effecting a most desirable Reformation. Oh! Sir, to these doctrines I would call the attention of my Roman Catholic brethren in the spirit of Christian love, for I assure them, my prayer to God is, not to say a word that might unnecessarily hurt their feelings—my heart's desire for them, is, that they may be saved.—I would then call their attention to the doctrines of the ancient primitive Church, and say in the words of the inspired Prophet, words so applicable to these times of religious inquiry, "Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest unto your souls."—The Resolution was then put from the chair, and carried unanimously.

The Rev. T. WALKER next rose, and spoke as follows:—Mr. Chairman, in addressing you on this important subject, I come forward under circumstances which may in some degree remove the imputation, which too often rests upon the advocates of institutions similar to the present. It is objected that the speakers are all on the same side, and that all come forward to discharge a sort of conventional duty to each other; the objection however cannot apply to me—for until lately, I was a decided enemy to the institution of Reformation Societies, upon the two common grounds—that in the first place, the object they professed was carried into effect by other and more ancient

Societies—and in the second, that they excited needless hostility, and raised up a definite and distinct mark, to be shot at by our enemies; a total revolution has however taken place, in my feelings and opinion on this subject; because, upon mature deliberation, I think the objections can be satisfactorily removed; and I now, gladly avail myself of the first opportunity afforded me; and stand forth this day, a supporter of the British Reformation Society. I conceive, Sir, that this Institution demands the support of every intelligent Protestant, because it makes a distinct call on him to extend to his fellow-countrymen, the peculiar blessings of the Reformation—because it relieves other societies from the imputation of being proselytising societies; and because it affords an opportunity of doing its peculiar work, by means of instruments which no other society can legitimately make use of. First, then, that it makes a distinct call upon the Protestants of Ireland, to come forward, and exhibit the scriptural beauty, and the glorious truth, of those principles which their ancestors established, and for which they suffered at the stake. It calls on them, to exhibit to the ashamed and astonished view of their Roman Catholic countrymen, their own principles, as stated in the decrees of the Councils of their Church, and their own principles as corrupted and depraved in the popular religion of the land. The contrast will put them to the blush for their condition—what they cannot correct they will disavow; and though while the doctrine of infallibility remains, such a thing as Popery will be found in books, yet soon, not a trace of it shall be found in this country, for the Reformation shall go on until it be rooted out. The Society demands support also from Protestants, because it comes forward nobly and boldly avowing its object; other Societies had not in view any thing which could be called proselytism; by which term, I do not altogether mean, merely causing men to change from the name of one sect, to the name of another—such proselytism, this Society disclaims as well as they; but, I mean the changing them from ignorance to knowledge—from error to truth—from darkness into light, and this with a particular reference to the religion of the Church of Rome. I mean the rescuing them from the power of sin and Satan, and sending them forth without their fetters, to walk the land, in its length and in its breadth, in the glorious liberty of the children of God. Former

Societies, it is true, were instituted for this, that the progress of light and knowledge, which follows the diffusion of God's word, should have effect, in changing men in this important way; but this Society takes up a ground, which they, from the nature of their rules, cannot.

Recognizing Popery, as the great, the overwhelming evil of the country, it applies itself with all its energies, to meet the prevailing malady. Convinced that Popery is opposed to the truth of God, we go forth to assail the giant, who defies the armies of the Lord. Like the stripling David, though apparently unequal to the contest, we boldly bid him defiance, and though armed with but a sling and a stone, we trust that we shall be more than conquerors through Him that loved us. Older institutions have been in some degree jealous of the introduction of this younger brother, when they ought rather to have hailed his approach, as that of a friend and an auxiliary. Their rule was to avoid every topic which might lead to controversy—to avoid all allusions to particular religious opinions, or to points in dispute between persons of different persuasions. The platform of former societies, was considered as a kind of neutral ground—as a green spot in the desert, on which men, opposed in other places, might all pitch their tents and bivouac together; they followed their peaceful course until compelled to abandon it. But henceforth they may be allowed to pursue their own particular objects, and to go on in their quiet and peaceful paths; while we take upon us to bear the whole brunt of that hostility, which was lately divided amongst them, forcing them to arm in their own defence, and turning their platforms into arenas for controversial discussion; we go forth in the power of the *Most High*, and putting on us the whole armour of God. We take in our hands the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God, the shield of faith which is the promise of God, and having on the helmet of salvation, which is the pure uncorrupted Gospel of the blessed God, and we will cause that sword to blaze in the astonished eyes of those who would oppose the progress of truth, until all its enemies shall tremble. I conceive, Sir, that this Institution demands our support upon another ground; because it puts into operation a powerful principle whose efficacy has been often experienced, but which comes not within the range of the duties of any existing Society—it calls into action a

principle which is alone found to be sufficient, in dealing with mankind, I mean the principle of individuality or locality. It is well known that the writings of many eminent men, of this and former ages, are comparatively little read beyond the circle of their immediate influence—they descend to the learned, they extend but to a few, while, let any publication though of inferior merit, issue from the local press of any town, parish, or district, and it is greedily received, and eagerly perused. Locality, is to a neighbourhood, what individuality is to a man: It touches the main-spring of all action; and its efficiency has been proved in many parts of Ireland by its effect.—In a parish in Connaught, the curacy of which I had the honor of serving, there existed a similar institution to the present, long before the Reformation Society was thought of. This institution issued a Tract which I now hold in my hand; entitled, “*Transubstantiation proved unscriptural, in two letters to the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the Parish of Westport.*” This tract met with most amazing circulation; whether owing to its own merits, or the principle of locality, I shall not now inquire. It soon was out of print, and the copies became so valuable, that a reprint of it was made by the Dublin Tract Society. A person who had lent one of them to a young boy, repeatedly applied for its return, and was as often requested for a little longer indulgence. At length he found the boy actually engaged in copying it in manuscript; and when he asked him what necessity there was for his so doing when he could now get one for a penny, he answered, that he dared not keep a printed copy, for that would be discovered and taken from him, but the written copy he could keep; and that he had already made seven copies of it, for different individuals. Thus this little tract, whatever may have been its merits, was able to obtain extensive circulation, when the works of a Jewel, an Usher, or a Taylor, would neither would have been known nor read. This Society then purposes to put this great principle into operation; and to afford every Rector and Curate of a Parish—every Landlord, or other individual, an opportunity of addressing from the Press, their parishioners, their tenants, or their neighbours, in such a way as may be likely to promote the glorious object in view; and to superintend the publication of such tracts, as from local circumstances may be deemed advisable, and to send them forth

among the population of the land—When we advocate this institution on these principles, a question arises, is its object really of such paramount importance, as requires all this trouble? Is the Reformation needed in Ireland? Is the religion of the people such as calls for reform? On this point I conceive that there can be no two opinions; for even Roman Catholics, if they appeal to their own reason—their feelings, or their conscience, must acknowledge, that the popular religion of Ireland is not in a state to reflect credit on their teachers, and cannot be regarded by themselves without shame. I know not whether a Bagnet or a Doyle may not be able to frame, by aid of sophistry, and Jesuitical manœuvre, such an apology for the written doctrines of the Church of Rome, as may appear satisfactory for a time—but they could make no such defence, as can remove the blush of shame from the cheek of intelligent Roman Catholics at such superstitions as the pilgrimage to Croagh Patrick and to Lough Derg—the worshipping at mountains and wells—and the oracular consultation of Holy fah; surely Sir, if they will answer truly, they cannot look upon these things, and then deny that the popular religion of the country requires reformation. The mode Sir, which the Society purpose to adopt, for carrying their design into effect, is the diffusion of the light of truth; they disavow and disclaim all other expedients. They adopt for their motto the noble declaration of Chillingworth,—“THE BIBLE is the religion of Protestants.” And in conformity with this declaration, they go forward to extend the Bible, and the knowledge of its truths, to every individual within reach of their influence.

When night holds her dark dominion over the world, men look upwards and admire the stars that glitter in the firmament; but when the light of the glorious sun arises, the stars and all their beauty vanish—a nobler object takes their view, and their admiration is at an end. Thus, as long as the darkness of error broods over the earth, and men’s minds are kept in ignorance of God’s word, so long they may admire many things which owe their beauty to the surrounding darkness—but when the dawn of truth begins, then those stars which constitute the glory of the Church of Rome fade before its beams. When *the sun of righteousness* arises with healing in his wings—when He sheds his bright rays upon the heart of man, the twinkling stars of error vanish,

before the splendour of his glory, and disappear before the brightness of his presence. It is therefore, to bring the light of God's word into the dark chambers of every man's heart, and to dissipate the thick gloom which broods over the land, that we have instituted this Society. Such is our object—and such the purport of the resolution that I have now the honour to propose: it embraces the fundamental principle of our Society, and of the Protestant Religion.

“THAT this Society recognizes the Revelation of God's will, as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only perfect and sufficient rule of faith.”

Here we are decidedly at issue with our opponents. But when we impugn the opinions of Roman Catholics, we do not mean to say, that those who defend them know their error—that they do not conscientiously uphold their system. No, we grant them the credit of sincerity, and we court inquiry upon the subject. We court manly opposition to our views, knowing that truth cannot suffer by investigation.—But let that opposition be carried on upon the principles of fair and free discussion. Let us come into conflict, if it must be so—but let it be the conflict of *intellectual*, not *physical* power—of *rational* not *brute force*. Let us try, examine, and measure the matter, bringing it to the test of reason and to the Word of God. The advocate for the doctrine of the Church of Rome tells us, “You mistake our sentiments if you suppose we do not value the Word of God as much as you do, but our difference lies in this. *The written Bible does not contain the entire of the Word of God—in addition to it there is the tradition of our Church, which we take to be as valuable a part of it, as your written Scriptures, and we say as you do, let the Word of God go forth, not in a garbled state but in its complete form—let your Bible and our Tradition proceed together, and then we will have all that man can require—all that is necessary to carry on the work which you and we are equally interested to promote.*”

I shall address myself, Sir, for a few moments to this, which I conceive the most plausible argument that can be put forth in defence of the Church of Rome. Our opponents first of all say, “On taking up your Bible, you must admit tradition before you can proceed one step



for you do not know it to be the Word of God except by our tradition." This I deny in toto. Tradition is what is delivered or handed down from age to age, either by written testimony or by verbal report; and it relates either to matters of fact, or to matters of opinion; and this distinction in its subjects, is of vast importance, and is entirely overlooked by our adversaries, if not indastiously concealed. The one is nothing more than historic testimony, the other human authority,—in the former sense, it must be admitted by every person—in the latter it ought to be received by none; because opinions cannot be transmitted for any space of time, without receiving an admixture of human error. Now Sir, it is on historic testimony as to its external evidence, that we receive the Scriptures of Truth as the Word of God. The evidence of the Scripture is of two kinds—*external*, that is historic testimony—and *internal*, by which is meant their own intrinsic character, and their acknowledged converting power. When we say that we receive the Scriptures on historic testimony, do we confine it to the testimony of the Church of Rome? No, we take the testimony of Jews and of the heathens as part of it, we take the testimony of those who in dark ages treasured up the paper and the ink—the several manuscripts and copies of the Bible, in their various libraries; and if the Church of Rome, has had any thing to do in that important work, let her take her share of the credit of it; it is nothing more than that of a register, a box, or an almanack. But we do not receive the Bible upon *her* authority—no, not a page, nor a single text of it—for we have found her false and deceitful to her trust, and a convicted liar cannot be believed, even though he speak the truth—she has corrupted and interpolated and garbled it—how then can we take the Bible upon her authority?—It is said that the Scriptures do not contain every thing necessary to salvation, but that Tradition also must be resorted to—In answer, I appeal to one passage out of many, from the sacred word which cannot err. When the Apostle John has nearly concluded his Gospel, he writes in these words, "And many other signs, truly did Jesus in the presence of his Disciples, which are not written in this book. But *these are written that ye might believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.*" I admit, for who can dispute it, that many things were

said and done by our Lord, during the period of his Ministry, which are not written in this book, but why were they not written? Because they were not necessary, the things which were necessary to our belief that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing, we might have life through his name, these things and these alone, were written.—Tradition, then, is either according to the word of God, or it is contrary to it; if it is the one, it is superfluous—if the other, it is false—I feel anxious, Sir, to embrace every opportunity that presents itself, of laying before the public as far as I am able, in a concise form, the real evidence on which we receive this book, as the inspired word of God.—For this subject has been so often adverted to of late, and the objections of the infidel so strongly put forward, that it is greatly to be feared, the faith of some unstable minds, may be shaken, and that the zeal of Roman Catholic Priests to keep their people from the vortex of Protestantism, may drive them on the rocks of infidelity, how many have been assailed with the argument; “how do you know your Scriptures to be the word of God? You are indebted for them to the Church of Rome, and her, you alledge to be corrupt.” I conceive Sir, the question may be answered in this way, we know the different writings in the Bible, to be the productions of the several persons whose names they bear; precisely on the same kind of evidence, but far more unquestionable, as we know the Commentaries to be Caesar’s—the *Iliad* Homer’s—the *Æneid* Virgil’s, we have direct historical testimony, that the Gospels are the production of the four Evangelists, that Paul wrote his Epistles, Peter his—John the Apocalypse, and the several writers of the Old Testament, each their particular part. And then having the fact established, that these men did write the several books, the question is, are they trust worthy persons? Have they deceived us in what they relate—is what they say true, or is it false? If we enter into all the points of their character as men of honesty, piety, and of wisdom, we find that on every principal of human conduct, they are trust worthy and credible writers. Lastly, we open their books, and we find them there declaring with one consentient voice, “that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,” therefore we have these three things—historical testimony, which proves the genuineness of the books—the character of the individuals who wrote them, which gives us reason to believe

their assertions—and their own testimony to the inspiration of the sacred writings. We are not to admit the common objection here, that if a man bears witness of himself, his witness is not true; for they bear witness not to themselves, but to each other, and in the mouths of two or three witnesses every word shall be established—their separate writings, are bound up in one volume, merely for convenience.

I conceive Sir, however, that far more important evidence to the inspiration of the Scripture is the *internal evidence* it contains, within itself. Let any man reflect on the proceedings of every day life, and he will acknowledge that such a thing as internal evidence exists—and we shall be able to apply such evidence most powerfully, in proof of the sacred Scriptures. If a work is published in the literary world, even though the Author's name be not affixed to it, those who are acquainted with his thoughts and turn of expression, can pronounce, with certainty, that the work is his. If a man receive a letter from a friend, he recognizes immediately the hand-writing or the style, even before he perceives the signature—circumstances familiar to him alone, are noticed—secrets known but to the writer, are alluded to—every word accumulates the testimony, and brings conviction to his judgment. And shall the God of Heaven make a revelation of himself to his creatures, far beyond the power of unassisted reason to discover, and shall they dispute whether that revelation be a cunningly devised fable, or whether it came from him, who knew his own nature? 1 Cor. c. ii v. 2.—“what man knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man, which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.” What says the Spirit of the Lord? “*He that believeth hath the witness in himself*”—When the Bible represents to man his own true state in a way which he himself could never have discovered, when it shews him as a fallen and ruined creature, lying already in condemnation. When it reveals to him a plan whereby the fallen, degraded, and perishing sinner, shall be raised to a height of moral and spiritual excellence, which suits well the dignity of human nature, when it tells him that having lived to the Glory of God here, he shall be happy for ever hereafter in his presence. And tells him that this was accomplished in a way which man could never have conceived. When it exhibits to us all the attributes of the Deity harmonized,

united, and glorified in the Gospel of our redemption, shall we say then, that it brings with it no internal evidence, that it issued from the God of Heaven—shall we ask whether it be devised by the wit of man or by the spirit of the Lord? surely Sir, the truths of the Bible are such as human wisdom could never discover—as human cunning would not suggest or devise—and alas! they are such as human intellect in its pride will not receive.

I have made a heavy charge against the Church of Rome, when I said that she has corrupted the sacred text, and I conceive that I am called on to substantiate my accusation—I am ready to do so, by the statement of two or three facts connected with the English translation, received by the people as her's, which are within the reach of every person, and the comprehension of every individual in the assembly. She translates the word *ἡλικιωτής*, 48 times by the word 'ancients,' a version not quite as correct, but something similar to our own; she gives the word 'old man,' 'elder' and 'eldest,' in a few places, and she differs from us six times only, in translating it Priests—These six places are precisely six of the most suspicious places in the New Testament, which make for the authority and aggrandisement of the Church of Rome. Another instance occurs in the words *Μετάνοια* and *Μετανοεω*, which she translates 49 times by the expressions 'Penance' and 'do Penance,' and in eight other instances, where these would be nonsensical or profane, she translates them 'repentance' and 'repent,' the third instance I shall mention, is the passage in the Gospel of St. John, "what have I do with thee," which we can prove by many references to classic Authors, is the proper translation of the Greek idiom, *Τί μοι καὶ σοὶ γένοιτο*. This passage occurs eleven times in the Old and New Testaments; in which the Douay and Rhemish versions, translate it ten times as we do; and in one solitary instance, they deviate from us; and will it be believed that is where it makes for the worship and authority of the Virgin Mary. These are facts that come home to the comprehension and research of every individual, and if they do not cause every Roman Catholic to suspect some tampering—some unfair dealing with the word of God, I wonder what exposition of fraud and falsehood will be sufficient to awaken their suspicions. I would now Sir repeat an observation I have already made, that the

yet denied what is self-evident. Now I heard several objections against the authenticity of the Bible; often were my ears assailed with the hideous din of infidelity, and I was not able to answer; then I was forced to consult comments, and spent much time and application in order to sift the question. There are several discrepancies to be found in Scripture. I will not say they are real discrepancies, I put it hypothetically—they are apparent discrepancies, and I challenge the most learned, the most ingenious man in the land, to come forward and say, that when he first read the Bible, he was not obliged to resort to commentaries to explain them. In the 18th chapter of the Book of Judges, mention is made of a City called Dan, to which its name was changed from that of Laish, when the Danites called after their Father Dan, the grandson of Abraham, sacked the City and took possession of it. This is said to have taken place, after the death of Sampson, which was 1100 years before Christ. Moses wrote the book of Genesis—and he died 1500 years before Christ, that is 300 years before the name of the City was changed, yet in his account he calls it Dan. How could he know by anticipation that this was the name it would receive after his death? This strikes at the root of the authenticity of Genesis. Is any Lady or Gentleman in the gallery able to solve the difficulty? Not one in the private spirit, Nay more, is any one on this platform able to solve it? I pause for reply. If I receive a solution, I will ask has it not been furnished by commentaries. I could produce many other such discrepancies, all of which I could solve as fast as I could propose, and let the distinction of my argument be borne in mind. I do not mean to say that the Bible has not been vindicated by learning, talent, and ingenuity, but I say that it requires vindication, and consequently cannot be put into the hands of illiterate men, for they will meet with objections they cannot solve. The pride and arrogance of the human heart, which does not let a man give up his own reasoning, will make him pervert the Scripture to his destruction. Rousseau and Voltaire, were men of ingenuity and learning: they read the Bible, and they put such ingenious objections to it, as I deem myself unable to answer; in such case I enrol myself under the banners of the Catholic Church. If the Gentleman cannot solve them without the aid of commentary and research, *causa*

*nuncius*, the Bible has need of an infallible interpreter, and every man who reads it without such an interpreter, may make the same objection as Voltaire or Rousseau, and terminate in the same perdition.

Mr. H. then recapitulated his questions and demanded a reply.

MR. WALKER rose to reply, but was interrupted by CAPTAIN GORDON, who spoke to order. It was something very like presumption, for a person who was not a Member of the Society, to dictate rules for the proceedings of the Meeting.

MR. HENNESSY said, he did not dictate—he knew his being heard, was only a matter of courtesy—but he had been promised an answer, and now it would not be given him.

The Rev. MR. WAUGH—It is rather too much for the gentleman to take it for granted, that he will not receive an answer. He is a very young man Sir, and on that ground I can make allowance for the warmth of his address, which evidently is intended for something, that is to be sent into the world through the instrumentality of the Press. There is not one of his objections that will not be met with the greatest readiness. Meanwhile, I am glad to find, that he is in so tractable a frame of mind, so anxious to be instructed, as appears from his own statements, and I congratulate you, Sir, upon the extensive progress that he tells you the Reformation has already made.

Mr. WALKER—It is an extremely unpleasant thing to be obliged to stand forward, without any previous consideration, to answer an objection which is not put in a tangible shape. And it is a point greatly to be desired, that when a question is asked, it should be put in some form which could be understood. This gentleman has asked—do we believe in the procession of the Holy Ghost? And he asserts that it is a doctrine not to be found in Scripture. When I asked him to explain his question, and to say what he meant by the objection, for the purpose of seeing how I should prepare my answer, I find that he knows nothing at all about the matter. Nor is he less astray, in the rest of his discourse than he is here—he knows as little of philosophy, as he does of religion, for he mistakes *assertion* for argument, and confounds

*evidents with axioms.* I will tell him precisely what *we* mean by the procession of the Holy Ghost. We hold that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and from the Son; we hold this doctrine in common with the Church of Rome, while the Greek Church denies it; and we bring these texts of Scripture to prove it. John xiv 26. "But the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in my name, HE shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." This speaks of the procession from *the Father*, John, xv. 26. "But when the Comforter is come whom *I* will send unto you." This speaks of the procession from *the Son*. We therefore receive, upon the authority of Scripture, the procession of the Holy Spirit, from the Father and from the Son\*. And while I acknowledge that it is a subject involved in awful mystery—that the utmost reach of human intellect, can no more conceive it, than the brutes that perish—that human reason is not competent to entertain it, but only to receive with deep humility, all that God has been pleased so to declare unto us in his word; while I do not in the presumption of impious folly, attempt to explain things above man's understanding; neither do I in the pride of human intellect, disdain to receive them on the ground of Revelation, I bow to the authority of Heaven and say, "Lord I believe help thou mine unbelief." I cannot, at the same time, but lament, that Roman Catholics are too ready to make common cause with the Infidel and the Deist, if thereby they can impugn the principles of Protestants; forgetful of the direction of the good old Patriarch—"see that ye are brethren, and fall not out by the way."—The second objection, turned upon the supposition that some of the inspired writings were lost. In this the gen-

---

\* I would beg leave to refer the reader to the following passages, in addition to that above cited (John xv. 26.) John xvi. 7. "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you."

Luke xxiv. 49. "And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry in Jerusalem until ye be indued with power from on high."—We find this done in Acts ii.—"And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost," &c. and at the 32nd verse St. Peter speaks thus, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses; therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost. HE HATH SHED FORTH which ye now see and hear."—T. W.

tleman is in error—none of them are lost: and as my time is very short and I have much to reply to, I will beg leave to refer him to Horne's Introduction to the study of the Scriptures, where he will find ample information upon the subject. With respect to Baptism with the sign of the Cross—I am glad I have an opportunity of explaining this:—because, as a Minister of the Church of England, I bow with submission to her authority, and obey her in the most indifferent things she enjoins; at the same time, I would for the satisfaction of the members either of the Church of Rome, or of any other denomination of Christians, here present shew the reason why we maintain this point. The Church of England, at the time of the Reformation, saw that she had two sources of proceeding. When she perceived that Christianity was grossly corrupted in the land, she said, if we remove every thing for which we cannot produce texts of Scripture, we shall give needless offence to thousands, in very unimportant matters. But, if we set ourselves to reform those things which are *repugnant* to the Word of God—which are not merely *unscriptural* but *anti-scriptural*, we will do all that our duty to God, to our country, and to our fellow-creatures requires. This was the great principle on which the Reformation proceeded in England. It cautiously, and wisely removed all that was untenable; but it left a great deal, for which no authority could be found in Scripture, but which it conceived, did not affect the salvation of her children, or the worship of God in spirit and in truth. Radical Reform, or rather total revolution, it is universally known is injudicious and unsafe: a cure to be effectual, must be gradual. Many things perfectly innocent in themselves, among which was the sign of the Cross in Baptism, had been a long time established in the country; and these the promoters of the Reformation left as they found them, not obnoxious to disturb ancient prejudices and exasperate long cherished feelings. And they acted wisely in so doing; for it may be recollected, that when a member of the British Senate, who ventured at a Radical Reform in Religion, wanted to introduce an Act of Parliament to prevent the bowing at the name of Our Saviour in the Cross, another member of the Legislature, an intelligent and sensible man, stood up and declared he would never submit to such a law—and that he would sooner leave his country altogether, than derogate from the



respect due to his Redeemer, by refusing to bow at his name. I introduce this as an instance to shew how far intelligent men may be carried by attachment to custom in things indifferent in themselves. As to what the gentleman has asked respecting the perpetual virginity of the Virgin Mary, I need not say a word upon the subject; because he ought to know, that Protestants do not believe it. His argument, as to washing the Disciples' feet, I will answer in the words of Our Lord himself—"The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.—The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Our Lord in that command, taught his disciples a lesson of that deep humility which best consists with true Christianity. Our great Redeemer descended from the throne of his glory, and took on him our nature, to teach us that principle of humility, without which we are unable to receive his Gospel. "Except ye receive the kingdom of God as a little child, ye can in no wise enter therein." That Gospel was "to the Greeks foolishness," in the pride of their hearts, while to every humble believer it is "the power of God unto salvation." Again, I am asked, do we not receive the first four General Councils? We acknowledge them in a certain sense, because we see that they decree nothing contrary to the Word of God. We admit them, in general as credible and faithful witnesses for the truth of our views of the sense of Scripture; because they record the belief of the Christian Church in the earliest and purest times. But we by no means admit their authority in any sense but that of a witness, or historian—we do not receive them as an authority to dictate to us what to believe, as paramount and supplementary to the written Word of God.

The next point is the eating of blood. I will refer the gentleman to the Acts of the Apostles xv. 19, 20, 21, where he will find the reason of the precept noticed by the Apostle from whom the decree immediately emanated. James, who presided on the occasion, and who, to use the language of the Courts, summed up the evidence upon the subject, says in conclusion, "Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned into God. But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. *For Moses of old time, hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the*

*synagogues every Sabbath day*" This is the reason of the precept; because the prejudices of the Jews were so alive—so quick—so sensitive, with regard to the ceremonies of their law, that had the Christian been permitted needlessly to infringe upon them in this instance, their indignant feelings would have been excited, and they would have been immediately offended. It was a matter of expedience and prudence at the time; but when the necessity for it is done away, the obligation ceases also. Nor let this position startle any, for thus the whole of the Jewish ceremonial law, though given by the most High God himself to Moses on the mount, was swept away when the object for which it was designed was fulfilled; and thus with regard to all precepts which have their foundation in the peculiar circumstances of time and place—their obligation ceases, when the reason for their observance no longer exists.—The next question is—If our ancestors had no written Scriptures, and in the dark ages took their religion on the authority of man, why not we also? Because we now possess the Scriptures, and possessing, dare not neglect our duty to read them. But the gentleman, I doubt not, labours under misconception here, as in other points. The want of a supply of the written Scriptures, although a great evil, did not leave our ancestors without the means of conversion and salvation. The Word of God—the Bible—is the source of all religious knowledge, and the test of all religious truth. But the *written* word is not the only means of religious instruction. The Word of God, when it is faithfully preached from the pulpit, or taught in a Sunday-school, may be the instrument employed by the Spirit, in man's conversion, as well as when it issues from the press. But we conceive that the *written* Word of God is more likely to be unmingled with human error, than any discourse however eloquent; and more likely to lead man into the way of salvation, than any instruction bestowed in a Sunday school. And therefore while I do not undervalue Sunday-schools, or other institutions of the same description, I hold the word of God to be the greatest blessing of the land. Neither, do I undervalue the preaching of the Gospel from the Pulpit, but I hold, that the greatest auxiliary which the preacher can know, is the Bible. I regard man's spiritual, as something similar to bodily wants, only far more numerous and important. And as one man cannot supply all the

bodily wants of any single individual, much less can he supply the daily, hourly, and momentary wants of his soul—much less still the wants of many hundred souls committed to his charge. He cannot impart to all, counsel in difficulty conviction in doubt, consolation in affliction, as often and as continually as the weakness of our human nature requires. But he can give them that, which contains a remedy for every man's wants, which will be a "light to his feet and a lamp unto his paths"—that which was designed by God himself,—“for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness, that the man might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” When the wretched sinner in the hour of midnight, lies tossing on the bed of pain—when his kindred and his friends worn out with watching and fatigue, have retired to seek their rest—when he knows no cessation from the writhing anguish of his bodily sufferings—in that dread hour, when Satan taking advantage of his state, while he goes about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, fails not to suggest some trying temptation to make him repine—to doubt, and to fall—then it is that the word of God comes home to his heart, and is heard when the voice of man is silent. And it is because, like the Royal Psalmist, we would have every man anticipate the night watches, that he might meditate on this word, that we endeavour to fulfil the pious wish of another King in *Israel*, that every peasant in the land might have a Bible in his house.

The gentleman has been pleased to be merry upon the subject of internal evidence. But I laid down a proposition perfectly plain to every person of common understanding; that men can speak with confidence of any work which comes to their hands, being the production of a certain author, from the thoughts it contains, and the style of the composition. I noticed it also in the case of a letter from a friend; and I said, that the word of God had this kind of evidence in itself, which carried conviction to the breast of every man. Those, who like my friend, know nothing of the Bible, or who read it, but to find out knotty points with which they may puzzle and perplex others—they I doubt not may be unable to perceive this evidence, but those who have studied it in humility and sincerity of heart, know and experience what it means. I held the internal evidence of the Bible, next to the Bible itself, to be the greatest boon which God has given to man.

Few are able to answer all the questions, and decide upon all the cavils that may be raised with regard to the *external* evidence of the Scriptures; though they *have* been answered over and over. Undoubtedly the poor and the illiterate man, never could go through all the objections that may be brought forward by the Infidel. But when he takes up the word of God, he perceives at once its author; because it tells him of such a God as man never knew—it tells him of such a salvation as man could *not* conceive—it tells him his own state, and that of others, in such a way as makes him say with David, “My heart teacheth me the wickedness of the ungodly.” This gentleman, when he endeavoured to oppose my position, laid down one, which no Philosopher but himself would have thought of. He makes no difference between evidence and axioms, and he finds fault with the *internal* evidence of the Scripture, because it does not amount to the latter; forgetting that an *axiom* is that which is apparent of itself, and is conceded the instant it is stated; but that *evidence* is what establishes the thing it is brought to prove, and which was not before certain. Internal evidence admits of long and various inductions and proofs—an axiom requires and admits of neither.

The Rev. Mr. WAUGH here rose, and proposed, that as it was within a few minutes of 4 o'clock, and as Mr. Walker had yet to speak to the most important topic of all, justification by faith, the meeting should adjourn until 12 o'clock next day. The motion was agreed to by every person except Mr. Hennessy, who wished to be heard in reply to his own objection, upon the passage from Genesis, which Mr. Walker had not spoken to. The lateness of the hour prevented his wish been acceded to; but it was agreed that he should have precedence on the following day. The meeting was then adjourned.

## TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS TO THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

---

"We have not an innumerable multitude of Books among us, disagreeing from, and contradicting one another, but only *Twenty Two* Books, containing the records of all past time, which are justly believed to be divine. *Five* of them belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the tradition; concerning the origin of mankind, 'till his death. But as to the time from the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, King of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes; the prophets who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times, in *Thirteen* Books. The remaining *Four* Books, contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life. Our history indeed has been written since Artaxerxes, very particularly, *but it has not been esteemed of equal authority with the former, by our fore-fathers*, because there had not been an exact succession of prophets since that time. And how formerly we have given credit to them, books of our own nation is evident by what we do, *for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add any thing to them, to take any thing from them, or to make any change in them.*"—(Joseph. cont. apion lib. 1. § 8:)

## SECOND DAY.

At 12 o'Clock, the REV. MR. BEAUFORT took the Chair, and addressed the assembly as follows.

Before we proceed with the business of this day, I think it necessary to recall to the recollection of the Meeting, that the purpose for which we are assembled, is not so much to discuss disputed points, or to give instruction by answering questions, as to consider the propriety of uniting ourselves, a Society already formed, with one having the same views, but more extensive in the Metropolis, and though the Members of this Society, wishing to act with perfect candour, and thinking the cause of truth always promoted by free discussion, are willing to permit gentlemen, duly qualified, to offer their objections, yet it is a matter of courtesy to do so, and it must be under certain regulations, one of which is, that the matter stated be relevant to the subject. Now the questions and difficulties started by a gentleman yesterday, are not of this description. For they regard not so much the points in controversy between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, as the objections and cavils made by Infidels, often urged and refuted, with regard to the validity of the Holy Scriptures; and other points which are equally in opposition to the Roman Catholic Church and to our own, in respect to which therefore we coincide, and these require no discussion here. In proposing questions of this nature to the Meeting, no other purpose can apparently be answered, but that of impeding the business and prolonging our sitting; unless perhaps the excitement of feelings of ill-will, which we all agree is a matter very much to be

deprecatcd. We must therefore request, that there may be no repetition of questions of this sort, and we must resist the introduction of such opposition. We must also require the observance of another condition. That any gentleman who offers himself to the notice of the Meeting, shall be possessed of a competent share of knowledge on the subject on which he speaks; a point in which the gentleman who occupied your time yesterday for some while, was acknowledged by himself to be deficient; for he told you, that he was unacquainted with the Book of the Scriptures, which he thought proper to make the subject of his observations. We deem it a fair test of a speaker's competence, that he shall, in the first instance, before he proceeds to put interrogatories himself, answer certain questions which were propounded yesterday, by the Reverend Gentleman who seconded the first resolution. These questions regarded the admission of the Apocryphal Books into the Canon of Scripture—the subject of Salvation by the merits of Saints, as found in the Roman Catholic Missals—the subject of Transubstantiation—the doctrine of intention—of Half-communion in depriving the laity of the cup—and of prayers in an unknown tongue. We hold ourselves pledged to the gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Hennessy,) to hear him state this day, under these conditions and regulations, some further points which he was desirous of stating yesterday, at an hour when it was too late to comply with his desire. We request him to observe strictly what is required, and to confine himself to the points at issue, between the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches—not entering into those subjects which are at variance with both Churches; and offered only by persons objecting altogether to the Christian dispensation. Any other gentleman who may have questions or observations to propose, we must decidedly refuse to hear, unless he shall give us such proof of his competence to discuss theological subjects. I must again request my reverend friends around me, to carefully abstain from expressions, which though used with no such view, and in their own conception perfectly innocent, may perhaps serve to create irritation in some sensitive mind. And I earnestly request, gentlemen, to refrain from all expression of their sentiments, whether of applause or disapprobation, of what they hear, by loud and clamorous plaudits. The plaudits justly earned by some of the Rev.

Speakers, yesterday, but too loudly given, created considerable interruption, and were unsuited to the solemnity of a religious meeting and a house of worship. The gentlemen on the other side, who are present, are requested also to restrain their opposition to a moderate declaration of their dissent; and not to allow any clamorous expression of it. We come here in no spirit of hostility to any part of our Christian brethren. We come in the spirit of christian love and friendship. Our great desire is to do a most essential benefit to those who will receive it. If our brethren disagree from us, and think proper to reject what we offer in love let them reject it—they have the use of their own free judgment; but let them not revile—and when we part, though still disagreeing, let us part in friendship, as brethren in Christ, as I trust we entered here.

Mr. HENNESSY then spoke to the following effect—Mr. Chairman, I was greatly disappointed yesterday, at not being allowed the few minutes that remained for a reply, as I had taken a few notes, and could have clearly established the truth of my assertion by texts of Scripture. However, I took the trouble last night, of looking over the Bible, and I find my positions are there fully supported. I referred to a Protestant Bible, and by it alone, I shall speak and be guided in my arguments to-day. I was much astonished Sir, to find that the learned gentleman who was in possession, did not display all that zeal and Christian meekness which is so consistent in a Christian Minister. He first proposed an unlimited discussion, to any person that pleased to interrogate him upon the subject of the errors of the Church of Rome. I as one, anxious to be informed of the nature of what was to be its substitute, came forward and offered myself to his notice, when, instead of satisfying my enquiries, he accused me of ignorance. It was a strange way Sir, to remove my doubts, by telling me of them; to enlighten my ignorance, by reproaching me with it. He has however mis-stated an observation of mine, which I will therefore now advert to. The first question, I asked, was—did he regard the Scriptures as being the sole rule of faith? As a simple and unsophistical enquirer, and according to him, an unenlightened and ignorant Papist, I wish to arrive at the issue of this discussion by the simplest means of coming to the ter-



mination of any discussion, which certainly is, argument by question and answer. I understand some of the Members of the Reformation Society are on a tour of proselytism through the country. I ask them, if they went into the hut of a peasant whom they wanted to convert, would they take out their watches, and tell him to make a speech for three-quarters of an hour, or would they hear and answer his questions, which would bring them to the point at once; whereas by speech-making, the question may be avoided, and the point at issue not touched upon, much less decided? Or, if I happened to meet one of these gentlemen leaving town this evening in a stage-coach, and if I proposed a question that affected his religion, would he tell me to get on the outside of the coach, and make a speech for three quarters of an hour.

The Rev. Mr. WAUGH rose to order.—A rule had been established for the proceedings of the Meeting, and no person had a right to come forward and demand them to break through it. They were not come upon that platform to instruct, one by one, every peasant from the field, but they were there, to establish a system, which should send the Bible into the house, and instruction into the heart of every peasant in the land.

Mr. HENNESSY.—I do not demand, I merely request it as a matter of courtesy. I made a speech yesterday, for which I acknowledge I was not prepared. I heard some observations while in the gallery, which I thought would not stand the test of examination. I then came down to this platform, where I was refused a disputation by question and answer, and was obliged to revert to a speech. I now ask first, is the Bible the sole rule of faith, or is it not? It is certainly, according to the principles of the Reformation Society. If it is the sole rule of faith, is it the entire or part of it that is the rule? If the entire of it be the rule of faith, why has God commanded the people to acquire their religion by an impossible medium, because as a great part of the Bible is lost, they cannot read the entire? If it is only a part of it, that is the rule, shew what part is the requisite part, what is the quantum sufficient and give me a text to prove it. The Rev. Gentleman took my dilemma, and he did not touch upon the second part of it. He grappled with the first in this manner. The

- Bible is the rule of faith entirely. If I had had then, the advantage of discussing the matter in question and answer, I would have asked him, are any books of it lost. He would have said, there were not, for he said so yesterday. But I took the trouble of consulting the Bible last night, and I found that it completely coincided with my argument, for it refers to several Books which are not now to be found. Perhaps you will say, they are historical. But I will refer you to some prophecies—the works of Jeremy and Nathan are lost, and two Epistles of St. Paul, to which I would advert if I had some tractable Bible.

The Rev. Mr. WAUGH.—Here is a tractable Bible as the world ever saw ; it opens for you instinctively.

Mr. HENNESSY—I meant to say such a Bible as I could hold with convenience. In the 21st chap. of Numbers, v. 14, mention is made of the book of the Wars of the Lord, I ask where is such a book to be found ? In the first book of Kings, chap. 4, v. 32. alluding to Solomon, it is said, “ and he spake three thousand proverbs, and his songs were a thousand and five.” We have not three thousand proverbs of Solomon, nor a thousand and five of his songs, 2d Chronicles, chap. 9, v. 29. “ Now the rest of the acts of Solomon first and last, are they not written in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the prophecy of Ahijah, the Shilonite, and in the vision of Iddo, the seer, against Jeroboam, the son of Nebat.” Where are any of those books now—can my learned friend account for them? Again, 1st Chronicles, chap. 29, v. 29. Now the acts of David the King, first and last, behold they are written in the book of Samuel, the seer, and in the book of Nathan, the prophet, and in the book of Gad, the seer.” We cannot find any books answering to these names at the present day. In the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, in the last chapter and 16 verse, he commands them to read the Epistle from Laodicea ? Where is this Epistle from Laodicea ? In his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 5, v. 9, he says, “ I wrote unto you an epistle. This was certainly not the epistle he was then writing; yet this is the first we have, where is the former one ? Matthew 27 c. 9 v. “ Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the Prophet, saying, And

they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued." Where are those words to be found in Scripture? they are certainly not in the book of Jeremiah, 1st Corinthians, 2d chap. and 9th verse. "But as it is written, eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, the things that God hath prepared for them that love him." I took this quotation last night from the works of the Rev. Mr. Whiston; he mentions that Paul used the expression, and that it was taken out of some of the books that were either lost or corrupted. I ask the gentleman to shew me where it can be found?

MR. WALKER, (shewing the passage) you will find it in Isaiah, chap. 64, v. 4.

MR. HENNESSY—Well I am no theologian, and it was Mr. Whiston misled me. Matthew, ch. 2, v. 23. "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophets. He shall be called a Nazarene." I would be glad to know what prophet calls our Saviour a Nazarene. If the gentleman cannot shew me that none of these books are lost, it devolves on him to take up the other part of the dilemma, and shew me a text which says that a portion of the Scripture is necessary and sufficient, and what that portion is. I asked him what did the primitive Christians do, who had no Bible for seventy years after the death of Christ, for it was nearly that time before the books of the New Testament were written; from what authority did they receive their doctrine. I asked him where did he find a text of Scripture for baptism with the sign of the cross, and he told me there was none—that he bowed to the authority of his Church, and that he recognised baptism with the sign of the cross as one of her rules. I asked him why did she direct it when there was not a text for it in the Bible, which is the sole rule of faith to the Protestant Church?—he told me that it was an old custom, and that it had been retained at the Reformation. I asked him is the Bible the sole rule of faith or not? If it be, why have you permitted a custom, no matter of what nation or people, that derive its authority from the Bible? I asked then where he found the word consubstantiation in the Bible?

MR. WAUGH—You made no such enquiry, and even now you

are going beyond the limits that have been prescribed; but proceed, Sir, with your questions, and you shall be answered: and as you profess such an anxiety for instruction, I trust you shall receive so much light before you leave the platform, as shall bring you completely under Reformation influence.

M<sup>R</sup>. HENNESSY—We find in Scripture, “unless I wash you, you will not have part with me: ye also ought to wash one another’s feet” I asked what was the meaning of these words? Baptism is allowed by Protestants to be a Sacrament, because it has the three essentials of one. It is an external rite—instituted by Christ—and possesses the efficacy of conferring divine grace. The text for baptism is not more imperative than the text for the washing of feet, if the passage be taken *junctis locum verborum*. Why then do not Protestants comply with the latter. Their church has not recognized the injunction; but has said that it was only a precept of humility; therefore the authority of their church comes in collision with Scripture—you cannot stand on Scripture ground alone, you must resort to the authority of your church. I will fold these observations in argument, and pass on to other subjects. You either take the Scriptures literally or by comment. If you take them literally, why do you not perform the rite of washing feet, when it is literally commanded?—If, by a comment, you and I agree that a comment is necessary for the Scriptures. I said yesterday, that it was at the first Council of Jerusalem that the law was made against eating blood. I looked last night into the Bible and I find that it was then the command was given, and not in the Council of Jerusalem; however this is nothing to the purpose, for if the commands of the Council of Jerusalem were binding *a fortiori*, so are the commands of the Scripture. The gentleman in his explanation of the text has not followed up my objection. Did not the Church observe the precept of not eating blood, lest it might offend the habits of some persons? I ask him does he stand independent of the Church or by it? If he stands independent of the Church, he is confuted on his own principles, because he brings the practice of the Church as an excuse for eating blood. If he does not stand by the practice of the Church, why does he eat blood? I touched upon the doctrine of

justification by faith, and did not at the time substantiate my argument by texts of Scripture. I could have given the substance but not the letter. I understand the doctrine of Protestants is, that justification comes by faith *only*. They may have a great many texts that justification comes by faith, but I say that they will not quote a single one that it comes by faith only, while I can quote three for them to the contrary. If they should quote texts equally strong, then I refer to my old argument, and direct your attention to the tendency of all my arguments, that in the conflicting testimony of Scripture we have need of interpretation, commentary and exposition. St. Paul says. "If I should have all faith so as to remove mountains and have not charity it profiteth me nothing." St. James in the 2d chap. and 14 verse says "what shall it profit my brethren though a man say he have faith and have not works;" and in the 26th verse, "for as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." I asked the gentleman yesterday, if the Bible was the sole rule of faith, what could those persons do who had never been taught to read, and as Printing was not introduced for many centuries, and Bibles were consequently scarce, how could the people in the dark ages measure their faith by a standard which they could not come at, and when they could not read it if they did? If he answers that it was read and interpreted to them, in that case he has recourse to intrepitation and oral instruction, and departs from the original standard. He has said that I confounded evidence with axioms—I do no such thing. I am not quite so ignorant as he supposes. Evidence is that by which the thing put before you is proved to be, what the evidence shews it. But there is no definition of self-evidence, it is the *ne plus ultra* of certainty. If your internal evidence is imperfect, it proves nothing; if it is perfect, as self-evidence is nothing more than perfect, internal evidence has all its qualities, and must be identified with it. If you say it is neither, shew me the medium between perfection and imperfection?—there is none. Mr. Walker has said that the Bible could be proved authentic as well as Caesar's Commentaries, or Virgils *Æneid*. I never heard of a man who doubted their authenticity; but I have heard of millions who doubted the authenticity of the Scriptures. I say then, that the Bible has no internal or self-evidence. I say that it has nothing of

the internal evidence that shines round an axiom. If there is an internal evidence in the Bible, what necessity was there for your being obliged last night to study a Commentary on it, before you could solve the difficulty I proposed to you, and which, if I had been allowed, I could have solved myself, though you could not. It went to prove, that there was not that internal evidence about the book of Genesis, that it is said there is, for no ignorant man would be able to solve it without a Commentary, (Mr. H. here repeated the objection relating to the City of Dan.) The fact is that Esdras revised the Bible after the Babylonian captivity, and substituted the new name of Dan, for the original one of Laish—just as a person revising Cæsar's Commentaries now, might substitute the word France for the word Gallia.

Mr. WAUGH—I deny that that is the solution.

Mr. HENNESSY, there may be another, but it is a solution, and it is not got from any intrinsic evidence, but from a commentary. If I looked one of you up with a Bible, and no commentary, would you be able to arrive at the solution of this difficulty, after any length of study, The fact of Esdras having revised the Bible, and given the new name for the old, is essential to be known to solve it—is that in the Bible, my friends? No, then you should either hear it, and that would be an oral comment, or read it. You cannot hear it from the Bible, for that is dumb, nor read it in the Bible, where it is not mentioned. But you should know it, before you could solve the difficulty, and thus you should go out of the Bible to prove itself. I would be glad to know, would that be looking for extrinsic evidence. But intrinsic evidence I hope my friends will allow, precludes the necessity of extrinsic evidence. I could give you a great many other objections against the Bible, which I could solve as fast as I could give them. I will put them to this gentleman, and let him solve them as I proposed them, and then we shall see whether there is that internal evidence he speaks of, You, ladies and gentlemen, who have read the Bible, when you hear the objections, will know in your own minds that you cannot explain them; and you will recollect that this gentleman has been obliged to resort to a commentary before he can do it.

The **REV. CHAIRMAN** said, he was sorry to interrupt Mr. Hennessy; but according to his own acknowledgment, he was deviating from the course prescribed, for he was bringing forward the cavils of Infidelity. After some discussion, as to whether Mr. Hennessy had a right to proceed in this line of argument, he went on.

**LADIES AND GENTLEMEN**—If I was to put any of these questions to you, you could not answer to them; but if I was to give you some notes and comments that I have at home, you could answer by reading them. This is strong evidence in favour of the necessity of comment. Can Mr. Walker pledge me his honour that he did not buy Warburton's Commentary on the Bible last night? If he did, where is the internal evidence he speaks of? If he did not, let him stand up and say so.

**Mr WALKER** assented to his having bought, Horne's Introduction.

**Mr. HENNESSY**—Then a Comment is either necessary, or it is not. If they are not necessary, why did you buy one last night?—Would you have done so, but to find out an answer to my objection? If they are necessary for a learned Divine of the Protestant Church, *a fortiori*, they are necessary for an unlearned peasant.

**Mr. WALKER**—They are not *necessary*—they are *useful*.

**Mr. HENNESSY**—I will take it on me to say, that if I was allowed to go with each of these gentlemen into a room by ourselves, and ask them to write down their solutions of these apparent discrepancies, they would all be different.

**Mr. WALKER**—That shews the insufficiency of commentary.

**Mr. HENNESSY**—If the Bible contains this internal evidence, why could not Voltaire and Rousseau, or other men, who have turned their talents to their own perdition, perceive it? Why would it not be as apparent to them as it would be to the peasant in the field? How do you know, but that he may be as great a genius as the learned Creitchton, and he may turn his genius like Voltaire to his own ruin.—What is the reason, that if the Bible be put into my hand, and I be desired to interpret it according to my private judgment, and then in

so doing I follow the reigning passion of the mind, vanity of intellect, and fall into the errors of infidelity, and if I put my thoughts upon paper, or give my doubts to the world, what is the reason that I will be prosecuted according to law, for what is the result of my private judgment—perhaps the only result I was capable of aiming at. I may be dragged into a court of Justice, as Taylor, and Carlisle, and other foolish men were. Carlisle, when a boy of my age,\* might have received a Bible from the hands of one of these gentlemen, and if they gave it to him, and desired him to exercise his private judgment in reading it, could they look unmoved at the imprisonment of that man—could they see him cast into prison without attributing to themselves the cause of it. And why? Because they have given him the Bible upon his private judgment, and he has perverted his intellect to his own destruction. Therefore is he prosecuted according to law, perhaps by the learned Bishops who are most instrumental in bringing about the reading of the Scriptures according to man's private judgment. Mr. H's time here expired.

MR. WALKER—I really feel exceedingly distressed at being again obliged to trespass on the attention of the Meeting, and I should hardly feel it respectful to you Sir, to come forward and repeat, as I am compelled to do, arguments which I have before advanced, in reply to the gentleman who has occupied the time, and tried the patience of the meeting. It will be acknowledged that I have no easy task, when I undertake to follow him through the various windings of his course, and were it not that I had the precaution of taking down the leading points of his arguments, I would be utterly incompetent to it; for I find with all his ingenuity, that I have still to grasp a shadow. The gentleman does not understand his own objections, and I cannot expect him to comprehend my answers, but I appeal to the meeting, and to you Sir, have I not clearly and explicitly, and to common understanding satisfactorily replied to his questions, involved as they have been. I shall however, once more, go over the ground I have already traversed, and briefly re-state my arguments of yesterday. I will first notice the observations which he made with respect to my unwilling-

---

\* We understand that Mr. Hennessy, had been a student at Maynooth College.  
Errors.



ness to enter into the interrogatory system of argumentation. One of my objections to this system was, that it has been ruled to be contrary to the principle on which we wish to carry on our discussions.—Every body knows that it tends to delay—that it leads too often to mere personality—to a mere waste of time and words, by enabling the speaker to catch at every casual expression, and undefined position, however unimportant, which may have fallen from his adversary in the hurry of the moment; and so far from keeping them to the point, it leads them away from it, “a weary chase and wasted hour.” A thought was suggested to me by a gentleman coming to this meeting, which is so strong an illustration of the effect of this mode of argument, that I cannot refrain from stating it, although it may perhaps be thought rather light for so grave an occasion. Those who are acquainted with field sports, know the great unpleasantness of a pack of fox hounds being occasionally drawn away from the chase, by starting a hare; and if they are young hounds, they invariably pursue the hare, and leave the true scent of the fox.—Such is the case with discussions by question and answer.—Quibbles are made every moment, and the disputants are led away from the great point in dispute, by every trifling occurrence. Therefore, if the object be to elicit truth—not to obtain a victory (and in the sight of the God of truth I solemnly declare that I have no desire but to establish truth) the rule that has been adopted for the government of the meeting, is better than any other; because, when objections are mixed with subterfuges, all are answered seriatim; and it is frequently impossible for a question, on an important theological point, to admit of a direct answer by a yes or no, there may be a misconception or a misunderstanding, or there may be a confusion in the mind of the person who proposed it. It is necessary that these should be first corrected and removed before we can give the wished for reply, and for this purpose, we may be called on to bring the whole weight of explanation and argument to bear upon the point.

The first *great* question which was left unnoticed yesterday, was with respect to a supposed alteration in the name of the City of Laish, and which has been laid hold of by Paine the Infidel. You all recollect, what a feeling of indignation was excited in the heart of every

man in England, at the blasphemous impiety, which brought over from America, the rotten bones of the martyr of infidelity, Paine; what a horror was felt at the attempt to procure adoration and worship to be paid them; canonizing, as it were, the relics of him, whom his country had driven into banishment. And, what is your feeling let me ask, when you find not only an inexperienced young man like this, but a man grown in years, reviving the spirit, and repeating the arguments of Paine, and causing him to be canonized as a saint of the Church of Rome! for such a tendency has the conduct of any Church which makes common cause with infidelity. The reason why I did not answer this objection yesterday, after my friend reminded me it had been omitted, —was, because I wished it to dwell upon your attention, and have time so to answer it, that the reply to it, might have its full effect. It is not a question of modern days—it is one of years—It does not affect the success of this meeting only, because it is an objection that strikes at the root of christianity itself, and it may be urged against the Roman Catholic, as well as at the Protestant Church. The question has been put in this form by Paine, and answered by the Bishop of Llandaff.

“Your argument is taken from the single word—*Dan*—being found in Genesis when it appears from the Book of Judges, that the town of Laish was not called *Dan*, ’till above three hundred and thirty years after the death of Moses; therefore the writer of Genesis, you conclude, must have lived after the town of Laish had the name *Dan* given to it, lest this objection should not be obvious enough to a common capacity you illustrate it in the following manner, *Havre de Grace* was called *Havre Marat* in 1793—should then any dateless writing be found in after times, with the name *Havre Marat*, it would be certain evidence that such a writing could not have been written ’till after the year 1793,” this is a wrong conclusion suppose some hot republican should at this day publish a new edition of any old History of France, and instead of *Havre de Grace* should write *Havre Marat*, and that two or three thousand years hence, a man like yourself, should, on that account reject the whole history as spurious, would he be justified in so doing? Would it not be reasonable to tell him—that the name *Havre Marat* had been inserted not by the original author of the his-

"tory, but by a subsequent editor of it, and to refer him, for a proof  
 "of the genuineness of the book, to the testimony of the whole French  
 "nation? This supposition so obviously applies to your difficulty,  
 "that I cannot but recommend it to your impartial attention, but if this  
 "solution does not please you, I desire it may be proved, that the *Dan*  
 "mentioned in Genesis, was the same Town as the *Dan*, mentioned  
 "in Judges. I desire further to have proved, that the *Dan*, men-  
 "tioned in Genesis, was the name of a town, and not of a river, it is  
 "merely said—Abraham pursued them, the enemies of Lot, to *Dan*.  
 "Now a river was fall as likely as a town to stop a pursuit, Lot, we  
 "know, was settled in the Plain of Jordan; and Jordan we know  
 "was composed by the united streams of two rivers, called Jor-  
 "dan and *Dan*."

Leaving the question of Paine and the answer of the Bishop to their  
 operation on the meeting, I will conclude this head by cautioning my  
 young friend, that he take care lest in his zeal against Protestantism  
 he subvert christianity. I have not any hostility towards the Gentle-  
 man, I do not wish to hurt his feelings. If any expressions, used by  
 me yesterday, seem to have given offence, and perhaps they were not  
 consistent with the solemnity of this meeting, which should be condu-  
 cted in a mild and christian spirit, I am ready to make any kind of apology  
 that may be deemed necessary—but my meaning of the expression,  
 "let God be true and every man a liar," was, that I would willingly con-  
 fess myself, or any person to be in error who was in opposition to the  
 word of God, my only motive is to promote the glory of God and the  
 Salvation of immortal souls, and I cannot bring myself "to call evil  
 good, and good evil," even to comply with the established etiquette  
 of worldly custom. The Gentleman's leading question was, whether  
 the entire Bible or a part of it was the rule of faith? I answer the  
 entire Bible is the rule of faith to us. The hinging point of his argu-  
 ment turns on the supposition, that many books of the Bible are lost, and  
 as I think it must be much more conducive to the cause of truth, to an-  
 swer in a way, by which every man may have the power of deliberately  
 weighing the matters himself, than by having recourse to the arts of  
 eloquence, if I was possessed of any, I will refer to a writer who is  
 clear and decisive, and leaves no doubt upon the subject, more parti-

cularly as the proof is rather too long for the time I have to speak. In order to satisfy the meeting and this gentleman upon the subject, I pledge myself that the extract shall be published in one of the public prints immediately;\* I will not therefore occupy the Meeting farther, than to observe, that several Books have been quoted by the writers of the sacred volume, who, by no means, intended to quote them as works of an *inspired* author. Nor does their being, quoted of itself, prove their inspiration, any more than the quotation by St. Paul of Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides, whose writings no person supposes to have been inspired. I have so many important points to speak to, that I am not able to dwell upon this subject any longer, nor press it as strongly as I would wish, Mr. Horne gives a complete answer to the question, as it relates to the Book of the Wars of the Lord, and all others to which the gentleman has adverted. The passage he has adduced from the 1st Corinthians, he is mistaken in supposing is not in the Bible; he will find it in Isaiah xlv. 4. The Apostles by no means always quoted the exact words of the Scripture, and even Our Saviour quoted from the Septuagint translation.

Respecting the use of the cross in Baptism. The Gentleman has asked, why I submit to the authority of the Church of England, and do I not give up my right of private judgment? I have said that when the Church of England applied herself to remove the errors which had crept into the Christianity of the land, she had two courses to pursue, one was to remove every thing, and establish a system of her own, the other to leave every thing she could with a safe conscience, and take away those only which were repugnant to Christianity itself, and dangerous to the salvation of her children. There are many things however, *which are not material*, and I think I made use of this distinction, when I said that I bow to the authority of my Church; for I by no means bow to it as a rule of faith. I subscribed to her articles, because I believed them to be consistent with the word of God, and having enrolled myself among her Ministers, I now think I am bound to submit to her directions---In doing so I make a legi-

---

\* See an extract from "Horne's Introduction" as inserted in the Cork Constitution of Saturday January 26th 1828.

imate use of my private judgment—because that judgment leads me to approve of the doctrines of the Church of England, and to submit to her regulations. Before I came here, I was a free agent, I might act as I pleased, but when I did come here, and by so doing made myself amenable to the chair, I think myself bound to observe the rules the Chair has laid down, for the direction of the Meeting. If I did not like the rules, I need not have come to this platform, but as I have come upon the understanding that I was to be governed by those rules, I feel myself bound to obey them. And such is my view of the authority of the Church of England, and the submission that I owe to it. Another of the questions put was this. Is the Scripture the sole rule of faith? Give me leave to explain a prevalent mistake upon the subject. There are many things worthy of credit, which are not to be found in Scripture, many things for which we have no direct precept—but *they do not affect salvation*. We have no precepts for half the actions of common life, in which we are called on to use our own discretion. I therefore say, with the sixth Article of the Church of England, that “all things necessary to salvation are contained in Scripture, and that nothing shall be held necessary or be required to be received as an article of faith, but whatever can be proved thereby.” With respect to Infant Baptism, which the gentleman has confounded with the use of the sign of cross, although it ~~does~~ not exactly apply to the question, however, lest it might appear, we shunned any point that may be urged—I will with the permission of the Chairman, make a few observations on it.

REV. MR. WAUGH—I feel the greatest hesitation Sir, in interrupting the very learned and eloquent argument, to which we are all listening with pleasure, but I must request of you as Chairman of this meeting, to prevent the Rev. Speaker’s proceeding in this course—not because he is not fully able to do ample justice to the subject he has undertaken, but because it is out of order, and will afford an example and excuse to other gentlemen.

The REV. CHAIRMAN put it to Mr. Walker’s own judgment, whether he was not infringing the rules that had been laid down?

MR. WALKER—My only wish Sir, is to satisfy this gentleman and the meeting—I shall therefore proceed to another point. With respect to the understanding of some passages of the Bible to which my friend has alluded, I would say that we are called on to make use of our reason and common sense, for the purpose of ascertaining their meaning, and we can generally by comparing Scripture with Scripture, in the exercise of the privilege which God has given us, say whether it is to be taken in the *letter* or in the *spirit*. Every person is able to appreciate this, but it is impossible that a general rule could be laid down, as to what is to be taken literally, and what figuratively. We all know that our Saviour spoke in a manner which is used in every country, but is the peculiar style of the East. This was the figurative mode in which he expressed himself, when he desired his Disciples to wash one another's feet. My friend has acknowledged this to be the true sense in which the passage is to be read, and in doing so, he unwittingly deviated from his own Church, for the Pope in his robes, washes the feet of twelve beggars, once every year. But the Church of Rome has always been the greatest advocate for the literal understanding of the Scriptures, not remembering that "*the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.*" The next subject, is the eating of blood. I feel obliged to apologise to the meeting, for again going over the ground, but when my friend has misinterpreted my observations, I am bound to set him right. I did not say that the Church dispenses with the observance of a command against eating blood, but I said when the Apostle James gave it as his opinion that Christians at that time should be restrained from using blood, his reason was as he himself gives it, "*that Moses had those that preached him in every city,*"—that is, "*that there were Jews converted to the Gospel in every city,*" and to avoid interfering with their prejudices, it was better to lay that injunction upon them. It was an injunction not affecting their salvation, having no moral obligation beyond their own precept, which was formed only for temporary expediency. When the necessity of it died away, of course the obligation ceased, and lest this observation should startle any person, I adverted to the Jewish Ceremonial Law and said that this which had been established by the authority of the God of Heaven, was done away, when the purpose for which it was

instituted was accomplished, and consequently its obligation ceased for ever.—Before I speak to the great point of justification by faith, which I wish to keep for the last, I will speak on the subject of what my friend calls the self-evidence of the Bible. I never said that the Bible was self-evident, it is by no means necessary that it should; nor does the gentleman seem rightly to apprehend the distinction between a book's being capable of furnishing to an investigating mind, sufficient matter to prove its authenticity and its being self-evident. Self-evidence is what belongs to an axiom, and it differs from internal evidence, in this, that its truth is perceived at once, but the latter is the result which the mind arrives at, after long investigation. Paley takes this course of argument in his great work, *Horæ Paulinæ*, in which he proves, from the style—from the introduction of peculiar expressions, and from the very nature of all the allusions in the Epistles of St. Paul that they must have been written by him, and that Paul's journeys as related by Luke, were really accomplished. At the same time, the evidence I speak of, may be necessarily more or less perceptible, according to the circumstances of the individual. As to the difficulties of the Bible, I allow that some passages in the Scriptures may demand long and patient examination, but the great, the fundamental, the important truths, on which the eternal doom of the assembled universe at the day of judgment shall depend, are so plain that "he that runs may read them, and the way-faring men, though fools, shall not err therein." That there is a possibility of doubt, respecting this enquiry, does not vary the matter—there could be no necessity for enquiry, if there was no doubt, and we might as well say that all who read the Bible, should be as well convinced of its truth before they saw its title page, as after they had finished its perusal. But the internal evidence of the Bible, is of such a character, that it brings home to every sinner's heart, who reads the word of God in the spirit of a little child, the conviction that it was written by the spirit of God. "That it has God for its author, truth, without any mixture of error, for its object—and salvation for its end."

The gentleman has adverted to some instances in the case of Voltaire and Rousseau, in which the unassisted exercise of men's private judgment has led them to depart from the truth; and has said that no

person doubts the genuineness of the classics.—The reason is plain—the *classics* contain nothing which wounds the pride, and alarms the fears, and exasperates the prejudices of man.—They do not represent man as he is, guilty, fallen, condemned, and tell him to come only as an humble supplicant to the throne of God for *mercy*. This is what excites the hostility of man to the Scriptures—this is what causes him to doubt their inspiration, to deny their genuineness, and to wish he could prove them false. The Lord has given men reason, but he has warned them that they cannot receive the Kingdom of God, unless they receive it in the spirit of a little child—In deep humility of spirit, praying to Him who best knows their wants, for light from Heaven to guide them—to that God who has inspired the Scriptures, for his grace, to read, to mark, to learn, and to inwardly digest them—“that they, by patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.” They are accountable to that God who gave them rational faculties, for the use they have made of them—let us not anticipate their doom, but let us take care, lest we follow in their steps.—The gentleman has alluded to the circumstance of Protestants using commentaries, and asked me did I use one? I acknowledge that I have a library tolerably well stocked with Books of that nature, and though last night I had not the privilege of access to it, I certainly did purchase the book he speaks of, for the purpose of reading it, and bringing its contents to your notice, because I think the arguments of other men, may be received with a less disputatious feeling, than any arising from a professed disputant on the occasion.

We, Protestants, value commentary, and every other means of illustrating and bringing home Scripture truth to the understanding, and the hearts of our fellow-men; but we value it no further than it illustrates the word of God, if it is contrary to that it is utterly worthless in our sight. Though it be a Horsley, a Lowth, an Usher, or a Newton; we appeal, from their authority, *to the law and to the testimony*, assured that if they speak not according to this word, they have no light in them.” When the gentleman asked, did we value commentaries, it may be presumed that he himself does, after all he has said on the danger of undirected reading of the Scriptures. I ask him, or any other Roman Catholic present, what is the authentic com-



mentary which the Church of Rome points out to them, and when a difficulty which has not been solved before arises, whither is the Roman Catholic to resort for an explanation of it, which will be infallible—where will he get an infallible explanation of any single verse? Can he call a general council, with the Pope at its head, for nothing else will he allow to be infallible. If he cannot, and if the question has not been ruled before, he must remain in abeyance until that event has taken place. Now, Sir, infallibility has done nothing for the Roman Catholic, that private judgment has not done for us, if she leaves him in doubt upon a single text. I believe I have given an answer to every point brought forward by my friend, except the important doctrine of justification by faith alone. It is known, I trust, to as many as are assembled here, that the Apostle Paul, has said—"therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith *without the deeds of the law*," and again, "*by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast*," now if that is not justification by faith alone, I want to know what is? There is a difference alledged, a sort of supposed metaphysical distinction and yet not a distinction in reality, which may be made between justification by faith *only*, and justification by faith *alone*. I assert that a man is justified by faith only,"—but I also assert that the faith which justifies, is a faith which is not long left alone, but when it justifies, it must be alone in the particular act of justification. There must at least be the interval necessary to allow the cause to precede its own effect, between faith and any good works. When a sinner receives in his heart the record of salvation through the blood of an incarnate Redeemer, on the authority of the God of Heaven, at that moment he is accounted righteous in his sight, and the moment that faith is received into the sinner's mind, it begins to produce its effect, it turns the tide of the affections of his heart towards the God who has revealed himself as a God of love. And looking on the character of his Creator, as seen in the Gospel of his Son, "he is changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord," 2 cor. iii. 18, the Apostle tells us "that in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision avail-  
-th any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love,

And this is the great mystery, which the carnal mind never can receive. Faith fills the mind with the love of God, and the effect of love is to produce obedience. And we know the difference of the obedience produced by love, and that which is the result of fear. I say then, we are justified *in the sight of God* by faith only, but that this faith is not found alone, by which I mean that when a man receives the truth of the Gospel, and comprehends it in all its glory, when God has revealed himself as "a just God, and a Saviour, reconciled through Christ Jesus, his heart is filled with love—he feels that he is not his own but that he is bought with a price." "And his desire is to glorify God in his body and in his spirit which are God's," the Apostle states this doctrine in the 13 Acts, 38 v. "be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you forgiveness of sins, and by him, all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses. Beware therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the Prophets, behold ye despisers, and wonder, and perish." Again, he says in another place, "it is by faith, that it might be of grace," signifying, that to exhibit the entire freeness of the gift of salvation, God has made choice of a mode of its application, which could have no shadow of merit in it—thus, subverting the foundations of human pride, and leaving no ground for boasting. "not of works, least any man should boast."

I find I have omitted one question which has been put—what did the people do when they had no Bibles, since the Scriptures were not compiled till after the death of the Apostles—what authority had they then for their direction? I answer, that during the time of the Apostles they had an infallible authority in the Apostles themselves, and as soon as the Apostles were withdrawn from the earth, they left behind them their written word, as an authority to the several Churches which they planted. But let it not be supposed, that even during the dark ages the world was quite ignorant of this book, for there were many copies of it, more than is imagined, or might be expected, though still there was a lamentable dearth of it, as there has been in our own country, until the last few years. But, Sir, the gentleman has confounded *the rule of faith, and the means of conversion, or instruction*—We do

not limit our operations to the print and paper of the Bible, we assert, that *the word of God* is the grand instrument employed in the conversion of the sinner, and the edification of the believer.—But that word is not merely, the print and paper of a Bible. If any man speak “as the *Oracles of God*,” consistently with their declarations, and amenable to their authority, he preaches *the Word of God*, and it will be effectual to the saving of the soul, when brought home to the heart, in demonstration of the spirit, and in power.” But to conclude, if we depart from the principle, of the right of every man to read the Scriptures for himself, and to exercise his judgment upon their contents, to what result will it bring us, but that, to which it has brought Roman Catholics, *to the establishment of the Inquisition?* Yes—to the establishment of the Inquisition, for if it be decided, that man has no right to exercise his private judgment in the reading of God’s word, according to the powers that God has given him, for which he must account, and which, if he abuses, he does it, as he does with regard to every other gift of God, at his peril; and if there exists a power competent to control the exercise of it, I say we must, we are bound in duty to God himself, and to the souls of men, to establish *the Inquisition*, as the best means of giving effect to that power, and of preventing what we deem to be an act dangerous to the salvation of immortal souls.

I will leave this consideration to have its own weight with the Meeting, and conclude with thanking them, and the Rev. Chairman for their indulgence.

The Rev. JOSEPH R. COTTER then rose and said,—Mr. Chairman, it is usual with those who are opposed to the free circulation of the Scriptures, to endeavour to raise up clouds and mists around the subject, in order that the light of truth should not shine upon the darkness of error. For this purpose, they have recourse to captious and ensnaring questions and objections, many of which are borrowed from the armoury of Infidelity, and are in themselves unfounded and unreasonable. It is our duty, however, as advocates for the truth of God, to “be ready always to give an answer to every man who asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us,” in the spirit of the Apostle, who

says, "The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves, if peradventure God will give them repentance, to the acknowledging of the truth." Sir, I have had the pleasure many times during my life, of entering into religious discussions with my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen; and I have the happiness to say, in the face of this assembly, that I do not remember an instance, in which I could charge myself or my opponent, with a breach of Christian charity and love. In this spirit I shall offer a few observations upon the point respecting which I conceive evidence has not yet been precisely adduced—that is to shew the *affirmative proofs* of the Resolution I have the honour to second.

"THAT the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only perfect and sufficient rule of faith and practice."

Now Sir, I conceive I shall have established this position affirmatively (for the objections to it have been most ably answered, and except they shall happen to come in my way, I shall not advert to them) if I make out three simple points: First the right of private judgment—that right which every individual possesses, to enquire whether he is following truth or error, whether he is "walking in the broad way of destruction, or in the narrow path that leadeth unto life.—Secondly, if I establish the right of every man, to read the sacred Scriptures, as the highest means that God had provided for carrying into effect that unalienable right of private judgment. Thirdly, if I prove the sufficiency not only of the whole of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, but of small portions thereof, for the salvation of man's immortal soul.

There are many points in which we differ from the present Church of Rome, and it is our duty, in the spirit of Christian meekness and charity, to satisfy Roman Catholics, when we come forward to impugn their faith, that we have good reasons for doing so.—I charge then that Church, with having "departed from the faith" of primitive Christianity, by denying the right of private judgment. Before I enter further upon this point, I beg leave to make a remark upon this word *right*. I would rather call it *THE DUTY of private judgment*; because if it is once established as a duty, the right to perform it will follow as a necessary consequence, inasmuch as no man living has a right to

debar me from the means of fulfilling my duty to God. Besides, the use of the word *duty*, gets rid of the cavils raised against the word *right*; for I have heard it said, if you grant a man the right to read the Scriptures, and that he should wrest them to his own destruction, how can you afterwards blame him as having done wrong? But regarding it as duty, points at once to the tribunal of God's Judgment, at which every individual will have to answer both for the manner and spirit in which he has performed it. The Church of Rome denies this right and duty; and opposes men in the performance of it, by every means in her power, whilst the great Head of the Church himself, addressing a multitude, including the most ignorant in society, says, "why of your own selves do you not judge what is right," Luke xii. 57—Again, he says, "*beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.*" Matthew, vii. 15.—In 1 John, iv. 1. the Apostle says, "Brethren, believe not every spirit, *but try the spirits* whether they be of God"—and St. Paul in 1 Thess. 5, 21, says to christians in general, "*prave all things*, hold fast that which is good," Again in 1. cor. xiv. 20, he inculcates the improvement of the understanding, "brethren be not children in understanding;" and it is worthy of remark that he is there adverting to the senseless custom, which some had begun to practise, *of having the public service of the Church in an unknown tongue.* The duty of private judgment, is also recognised in Heb. xi. 6, as an essential quality in true faith, "without faith it is impossible to please God, for he that cometh unto God, must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them *that diligently seek him.*" There are many other passages, to which did time permit I might draw the attention of the Meeting; I shall consider these as sufficiently establishing *the duty* of all men, as they shall answer for it at the last day, to ascertain for themselves, whether they are in the way of salvation or not—and, I shall pass on to the second head of my subject, *the duty of reading the Scriptures, as the highest and best means which God has given to man*, for fulfilling this, before—established duty of private judgment. In the sixth chap. of Duet, v. 6, it is said concerning the 5 books of Moses, "these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them di-

ligerly unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." The same reference to God's written word, is made in Isaiah viii. 20. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." If we turn to the New Testament, we find our blessed Lord saying, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life." John v. 39. Here Sir, an objection is raised, that the passage may be translated "ye do search the Scriptures" but admitting this were the case, (which cannot be proved) would it not shew an established custom in the Church of God, at that time, of searching the Scriptures?—If we look to Matthew xxii. 29. and to Mark xii. 24. 27. we find our Lord ascribing the greatest errors, to ignorance of the Scriptures, "Ye do err because ye know not the Scriptures." again "Ye therefore do greatly err." In 2 Tim. iii. 16. we find St. Paul commending Timothy, "because that from a child he had known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto salvation." In Romans xv. 4. it is said, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope."—Here Sir, I beg leave to remark, that our principle on this head is misrepresented by those who oppose us; it is not to get rid of preaching and commentary altogether, but to use them in conjunction with the Bible. Our object is to give the written Word, as a remedy against any error that may be taught by the preached word, or by the commentary—that preaching, and the written word, may be as it were the two grand pillars of Gospel instruction, *the written, to correct the preached word where it is false, to supply the place of true preaching where it is not, and to go hand in hand with it, where it is.* These are our principles and practice, upon the subject, and they coincide with the practice of the Apostles; for if we turn to Acts xvii. 2. we find them proceeding exactly as we do, giving the preached and written word together, and appealing to the Scriptures for the truth of what they taught—"And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." And we find the *latter* of those times, using the Scriptures as *we* would have them; in the 14th

verse of the same Chapter, it is said of the Bereans "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and *searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so;*" and mark the happy consequence, "therefore many of them believed." Yes, my brethren, believed to the salvation of their immortal souls.---Again, I ask my Roman Catholic Brethren, who has a better right to read a letter than he to whom it is addressed? And you will find by refering to the Rhemish Testament, for the address at the commencement of each of the Epistles (the very part of scripture charged with greatest difficulties) that they are almost all addressed to the laity, as well as to the Clergy, ---nay, the latter are only mentioned in that to the Philippians, and there only, in conjunction with the Laity.---But why should it be necessary to resort to the Scriptures, to upset the practice of forbidding the reading of the Word of God! Does not the light of reason and nature, teach us sufficiently that it argues a disrespect towards the Author of that word, for which those who are guilty of it, will be fearfully accountable. I am so impressed with this idea, that I would not for thousands of worlds take it upon me to say to a Protestant parishioner, "My friend, *I grant you permission* to read the Bible." because the meaning of that would be (Inasmuch as God speaks to us in the Bible,) *that I would grant permission to the great God of Heaven to speak to his creatures!* How much greater presumption then, is it in those, (but we would in charity hope that "they know not what they do") who say "we will *not* grant permission to the most High God to speak to his creatures!

Now Sir, I come to the third point---*The sufficiency of the Scriptures alone, in all points necessary to salvation, and instruction in duty.* If we turn to 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17, we find this plainly taught in these words "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." This, Sir, applies to the whole of the Scriptures, which are thus profitable and necessary, *as our perfect rule of faith and practice.* But the truths on which salvation depends are few and simple; and I undertake to prove not only that the whole Scripture contains what is sufficient for salvation, but

that small portions of it---single books;---chapters---parts of chapters---nay even single verses contain all that is absolutely and indispensably necessary. I will refer you to Mark xvi, 16, where our Lord gives his last commission to the Apostles to preach the Gospel: take notice of his words "he that believeth---*shall be saved.*" Now we have only to ascertain what particular points he commanded to be preached and we have what is doubtless sufficient for salvation. The 24th Chapter of Luke ver. 47, *furnishes us with those very points*; for in the account there given of the last commission it is "that *repentance and remission of sins*, should be preached in his name among all nations." Here Sir, we have clear proof that *repentance and remission of sins* in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ as "the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world" is all that is essentially necessary to salvation, however profitable and necessary other parts of Scripture may be, to lead us more fully into the way of the Lord, and the knowledge of our duty.---Again, we have no less than four Gospels in the new Testament; and why should they be called *Gospels*, if any thing essential to the Gospel is omitted?--But St. John says of his own what establishes his sufficiency: if we had nothing else; "These things were written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing *ye might have life through his name*" John xx, 21.---St. Luke tells us (Luke i, 3 and Acts i, 1,) that he *wrote of all things* that Jesus did and taught; and it would be strange to suppose that after saying this he should omit any thing essential to salvation.---Even smaller portions would be sufficient, if we had no more. I will take as one instance from many, our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus in John 3d chap. Surely Sir, if a sinner came to a Minister of any Church in the present day, and asked him the way of salvation he would not be a true Minister if he allowed him to depart without informing him of every thing he thought necessary for that end. And can we suppose that our blessed Lord, who shed his blood on the Cross for perishing sinners, would let the enquiring Nicodemus go away without full information as to all that was necessary?

But we need not leave the matter to reasoning of this kind; because we are told by our Lord in his discourse with Nicodemus, that he was declaring what was sufficient for salvation. Alluding to the



brazen serpent, which when looked upon by the Israelites, produced a healing cure in the body, He through this, teaches the certainty of the Salvation of every soul, who should look to His death upon the cross with the eye of faith; "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on him *should not perish but have eternal life*," John iii. 14. 15.---Here is sufficiency for salvation, in two verses!---The same may be said of our Lord's discourse in the 6th. Chap. of John, which is so grievously misunderstood by Roman Catholics; where expressing himself in his usual style of figure or parable, he declares the certainty of the salvation of every soul that trusts rightly in his death upon the Cross; "who eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life" v. 54;---"the bread that I shall give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world" v. 51; alluding to the soul's being nourished by faith in that atonement on the Cross, as the body is by food.---The same sufficiency must be supposed in the various inspired Sermons, in different parts of the book of Acts; as Peter's Sermon in the 5th. Chap. where he says "Him, hath God exalted, to be a Prince and a Saviour to give *repentance and forgiveness of sins*" v. 31. Here we find the Apostle in the act of fulfilling the commission he had received in Luke 24, 47, the sufficiency of which we have before proved.---I trust Sir, I have established to the satisfaction of the Meeting, not only that the whole Scripture is profitable---for the same gracious truths cannot be too often repeated, nor instruction in righteousness too fully detailed---but that even small portions of it, *had we no more*, would suffice for our salvation; and therefore that there is no foundation for the cavil which is built upon the false supposition that some books of Scripture have been lost. Even if this were true (which is not) our salvation would not be in the least endangered thereby.

I shall now give a proof of the sufficiency of Scripture, which may perhaps suit the peculiar views of my Roman Catholic Fellow-Countrymen; it follows from one simple point: its enabling us to distinguish by the most clear and decisive marks, *a true Church from one that is false and apostate*. In the 9, 10 and 11 chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, we find St. Paul arguing in a most interesting manner with the Jews, and meeting objections very si-

similar to those which are now urged by Roman Catholics against the Protestants. It will be admitted that no Church could have greater privileges than the Apostle ascribes to that of the Jews;---he says of them ix. 4 v. "to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the giving of the law, *and the promises.*" Yet we find him afterwards declaring that *all these privileges were forfeited by the denial of one single doctrine*---the all important and essential doctrine of *justification by faith only* through the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. "What shall we say then that the Gentiles which followed ~~not~~ after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith---but Israel which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to righteousness. Wherefore? *Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law;*" ix. 30---32.---He then goes on in the tenth Chapter to confirm the thing more strongly; "Brethren my heart's desire, and prayer to God for Israel, is, that they may be saved; for I bear them record, that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge; for they being ignorant of God's righteousness, *and going about to establish their own righteousness*, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. *For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.*" Thus he laments over fallen Israel, because they thought to establish their own righteousness, and sought it not by faith only through Christ. And in the 11th chapter, he gives it as the mark of the true church, the holding the doctrine in question, where he proceeds to explain the reason why the visible kingdom of Israel was cast off, and the promises of God were fulfilled, only to a small number, "I say then hath God cast away his people? God forbid---God hath not cast away his people whom he foreknew, at this present time there is a remnant according to the election of grace, *and if by grace then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace,*" mark how he describes *the true Church* as holding justification by faith through the righteousness of Christ, and not through man's righteousness, as plainly as he had before pointed out the *Apostate Church*, as having lost it. He makes the claim of any church to the title of *true*, to depend entirely upon that very doctrine, which our opponents have cast upon us as our error! The great Martin Luther understood

this well, when he called the doctrine in question, the article of a standing or a fallen church. It involves the leading question on which the Church of Rome and the reformed, originally divided *whether a sinner's justification before God, is to be accomplished by the merits of frail and fallen man, or by the finished work of the Almighty Saviour of the World, who by his death on the Cross endured the curse of God's broken law, and purchased back man's forfeited title to the heavenly inheritance.* This Sir, is the only doctrine which I, in the prospect of eternity, can find as a sure anchor for my soul. When this comes home to the heart there is no danger but all will be right. The pardoned sinner who has tasted that the Lord is gracious, will not again wilfully offend the kind father who has received him with the open arms of mercy--has put upon him the best robe, saying "this my son was dead, and is alive again, was lost, and is found."--Such are the terms on which all must seek, for pardon and for salvation--and however highly I respect this Meeting, I must remember that I am addressing accountable beings, moving on through a short and uncertain life, to the judgment of the great day. In conclusion therefore, I would call upon you, my Christian brethren, to attend to these things before they are hidden from your eyes--to seek diligently for a heart-felt knowledge of that glorious doctrine of justification by faith, which is the power of God to salvation, to every one that believeth. This alone can guide us safely, through a world of trial and trouble--this alone, when death draws his dark curtains round our bed, can shed a ray of true heavenly light on the gloom of that hour, which shall penetrate through the valley of the shadow of death, into the bright regions of immortality and glory.

The Resolution was put from the Chair and carried.

The REV. B. SWETE proposed, that as only an hour and forty-five minutes remained, and as they had yet two resolutions to move, the time should be divided between the gentlemen, each speaking 35 minutes; and that at Four o'Clock the meeting should conclude.

MR. FALVEY rose to speak, but the Chairman declined hearing him, the resolution having been carried.

MR. HENNESSY asked, had it not been laid down as a rule,

that no two speakers should follow on the same side? and did not Mr. Cotter speak last.

The REV. CHAIRMAN explained, that the Society was met to discuss certain resolutions proposed for the adoption of its own members, who were of course at liberty to speak in what order they pleased---the rule related only to gentlemen not members.

MR. HENNESSY, this is a mockery of discussion.

The CHAIRMAN---sit down, Sir.

The command was obliged to be repeated, *once or twice*, before Mr. Hennessy would comply---seeming disposed to address the Meeting again.

The REV. MR. WAUGH, it would be a strange thing, Sir, if after all the courtesy and politeness that has been shewn to that young man, he should be allowed to occupy and fritter away the whole time of this most respectable meeting. Let his prompters in this matter come forward, and we will readily listen to *them*.

MR. O'LEARY rose on the part of the Roman Catholic Clergy, who he said had been alluded to.

The CHAIRMAN---the Roman Catholic Clergy have not been alluded to. We are a Society met for the adoption of our own resolutions; and if in courtesy we are disposed to hear any gentleman speak, it must be under the rules we have adopted, and under no other.

MR. O'LEARY, would be sorry that the dignity and respectability of the Meeting were forgotten. It had been said that Mr. Hennessy was spirited on. That Gentleman was spirited on by nothing but the spirit of enquiry; and he requested that observation might be recalled.

MR. WAUGH said he would explain in due time.

MR. FALVEY was then allowed to proceed. He could not insult his religion, the religion of a Xavier, a Cyprian and an Augustine---the religion of 1800 years standing, by supposing it needed his defence, he did not stand there to defend it. Nor would he insult the victory which an uninspired Mountain Priest had gained over the Goliath of methodism.

But he came there to ask, what religion it was, which the gentlemen were so anxious the people of Ireland should receive. They admitted that Roman Catholics possessed the essentials of salvation ; and he would shew them, that if they put the Bible into the hands of untutored persons, they put into their hands the means of denying the essentials of christianity ; and put them in a way of working out their eternal damnation (*no no*) therefore it would be more expedient to leave the Catholics of Ireland in possession of the religion they already had, and which they acknowledged possessed the essentials of salvation. A man might be a Bible reader, and yet not a Christian. He himself had read the Bible, and he found in it a great number of discrepancies. For instance, the doctrine of the Trinity, was part of the Christian faith ; yet he found Christ, in the 13th chap. of Mark 32d verse, denying that he possessed the attribute of omniscience. "Of the hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son ; but the Father."

CAPTAIN GORDON, this Sir, is the argument of a Socinian ; and I submit, that the gentleman is breaking through the rules of the Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN, did not agree with Captain Gordon. Mr. Falvey's line of argument was intended to shew, that the use of the Scriptures was dangerous ; and for this purpose, he was producing the errors that he supposed ignorant persons might fall into.

MR. FALVEY, if then the indiscriminate reading of the Bible leads to Infidelity, then your principles must lead to Infidelity.

MR. WAUGH, it has been ruled, that the points in dispute between the Roman Catholic and the Reformed Churches only should be discussed ; and that Socinian and Deistical points should not be entered on. I conceive that Mr. Falvey is endeavouring to prove, that reading the Scriptures leads to Socinianism and Deism, he is stating the arguments made use of to support those doctrines ; and therefore, according to the rule laid down, I conceive that he is out of order.

The Rev. CHAIRMAN would put it to Mr. Falvey, if he had not better desist from that line of argument. He was to be limited to the points in discussion between the Church of Rome and the Church of England ; but these Churches agreed in holding the divinity of Our Saviour ; he must therefore see that he was out of order.

Mr. FALVEY did not stand up as the Champion of the Church of Rome, and he ought not therefore to be compelled to defend her. He but followed the precedent which Mr. Hennessy had been allowed to set him; and he Mr. F. ought not to be debarred from what was conceded to him.

The Rev. CHAIRMAN---Mr. Hennessy had certainly deviated from the rules yesterday; and in consequence they had been laid down again more strictly that morning, giving due notice to every person that their observance would be required. Mr. F. had received that notice; and he had no right to plead a former deviation as an example.

The Rev. RICHARD LEE said, the right of private judgment was one of the controversies between the Protestant Church and the Church of Rome. Mr. Falvey in order to support his opinion, that the right of private judgment ought not to be allowed, was taking that line of argument by hypothesis, in order to shew that the exercise of it was unsafe; and he (Mr. L.) thought he was within the limits of the rule.

Mr. FALVEY--- thank you Sir, that is really my view. I am glad to find that there is one gentleman of the Established Church, a man of talent and of genius, who is able to understand my views. [After an intimation from the Chair that he was at liberty to proceed, Mr. Falvey went on] Christ in the most unequivocal language had declared that he did not possess the attribute of Omniscience. If he was told that this related to the hypostatic union, between the humanity and divinity of our Saviour, he asked, what authority was there for that explanation? There was none---It was but a mere dictum of the person who gave it. Again Christ had said "of himself he could do nothing," and who dared deny the words of Christ? Here then there were two attributes essentially requisite to divinity, omniscience and omnipotence, expressly declined by Christ not to be his. How, he would ask, was a person taking the Scriptures for his sole guide, to reconcile this with the doctrine of the Trinity?

He (Mr. F.) did not understand the object of the Meeting---he suspected their object was a kind of spiritual Quixotism; get up for the purpose of insulting the people of Ireland. It seemed to be expected upon the first day, that the Roman Catholic Priest would

come forward to oppose the pitelous crusade; but they respected the dignity of their cause too much, they thought it unnecessary to enter into argument with men, who for ought they knew, had no religion whatever. [A person in the crowd here called out, "your own brother is here."] If he is here, but I suspect he is not, he never was, and will not now be ashamed, to give evidence of the faith that is in him.

MR. WAUGH, would say that if Mr. Falvey's brother was here, he had a right to be heard: and if he was, he had no doubt he would conduct himself as a Gentleman.

The REV. MR. FALVEY stood up from among the crowd, and said Mr. Chairman. It has been stated that I was present, and the statement was thrown out, I suppose, with the intention of asking the question, whether I was ready to meet those who assailed the religion of which I am a professor. If this was the design, they who imagined it, should have had better memories than not to have recollected that I stood forward proudly, on a former occasion, and did not shrink from the defence of my principles. The religion I profess, is one which I hold in the deepest respect; and let no man say that I was ever afraid or ashamed to stand forward its advocate; and to shew the fallacy of those men who endeavoured to overturn it. I have been a listener Sir, and it was my intention to have been a silent listener to your proceedings. I did not intend to address the Meeting, I heard the speeches on one side, and the other, I heard the arguments brought forward against that child in years, but man in intellect; and I did not hear him answered, and Mr Chairman, let it not be supposed that a feeling of terror or unwillingness exists in the mind of any Roman Catholic, to meet any person who wishes to argue upon the point of religion. It may be a mere matter of explanation, for it is not my wish to offend, but I would ask, with what view this Meeting is got up? I know I am surrounded with Protestants, perhaps Seventy to One; but if you proceed upon the professed principle of your Meeting, hear those who will speak *pro* and *con*—hear those who will give one side, and hear those who will give the other. I have observed the becoming complaisance with which the Rev. Mr. Walker certainly deserved to be heard; but I have heard also the various interruptions with which that child

30 years, I will again call him, but man in intellect, was received. I marked the difference between the attention that was paid to one, and the attention that was paid to the other, and I say his arguments have not been answered. If Mr. Walker has the manliness to stand before him, let him do so, and let him answer his questions, not by speeches, but by argument. I heard Mr. Walker's objection to this, his bright and beautiful simile about a Pack of Harriers following a Fox, with which the Rev. Gentleman so forcibly illustrated his argument: but I think it went strongly against himself, for in my opinion, if the hound be true, and you let him alone, he will run down something or the other in the end. He speaks of personalities being produced by this system, but I ask him, did that child with the vehemence of youth, and the incentive of bad treatment, depart from decorum, when he ungenerously put on him the charge of following in the steps of the infidel Paine---when, though the arguments were not made his own, but used for the purpose of shewing that some authority was necessary to correct the wanderings of the human mind, he turned round upon him, and assuming the man, the dignitary and the Priest, he lectured him for what he never meant. I am only amazed that his own spirit did not raise him up on that platform to vindicate his name, I will not say terminate his victory. The form of the argument was this---that the contents of the Bible did not give that *prima facie* evidence; which it would seem to require; and if it did not, where was the evidence got, was it from the private spirit? It was not---Where then did it proceed from?

MR. HENNESSY, let him come forward now and oppose me.

The REV. MR. PALVEY, in vindication of that young Gentleman, I will boldly state, that it is not by speech-making that truth is to be attained; but by a categorical examination. It is true that to some questions in theology, we cannot give a direct yes or no; but there is not a question which will not admit of that, or a distinction, which can be afterwards explained. In this way you would come directly to the point in issue: if your answer was correct, it would carry conviction along with it, if you did not answer, it would be because you were unable. Commence and go through a categorical examination now---if you please, I am ready to undertake it,



Having said so much, I will only add that I would not have interrupted you, or come forward at all; but that it was shouted with an air of triumph, "the brother of the last speaker is here." I echo---he is here.

MR. FALVEN, I have met so many interruptions, that I think it useless to proceed further; especially when I perceive my brother, putting aside every personal feeling, and challenging your whole conclave. He has endeavoured to set the Meeting right with respect to Mr. Hennessy's object in wishing to proceed by question and answer, with which his opponent is afraid or ashamed to comply. And when the Gentleman finds he cannot give a direct answer to his objections, with the tact of an accustomed Orator, he endeavours to engage your attention, by sweet and delicately rounded periods. I will now give up my time, although I could have made many arguments upon the subject, and leave the question between the Rev. Gentleman and Mr. Hennessy. If my brother necessarily does interfere, I know I shall not be ashamed of him.

MR. HENNESSY, I only asked two minutes yesterday to solve the objection I brought from a deistical writer, and they would not be granted to me. I mentioned that objection, to show that it could not be answered but by a Commentary; and I ask you Mr. Walker, if you could have solved it without one, why did you purchase Doctor Warburton's Commentary on the Bible last night? I give you this dilemma, and take up my argument *ipsis verbis*. Give me a yes or no; or a distinction. You cannot object to it, for if logic be not the way of coming at truth, why is it the medium employed at all the Universities in the world? I ask any of the Reverend Gentlemen here, if they ever went through a theological examination in College, that was not by way of question and answer? My argument is this: either a commentary is required for the Scriptures, or it is not---you cannot deny that certainly---If it is required, what is the reason that you deny the people the use of commentaries? If it is not required, why did you apply to one last night to clear up an objection, which you could not before have done?

MR. WALKER. The question with respect to this apparent discrepancy, between the Book of Judges and Book of Genesis, is whether it is not explicable without reference to an infallible authority;

and if it is not, I appeal to the Meeting, where is the infallible authority which is to satisfy the mind of any man ?

MR. HENNESSY,---I made use of no such words. Either commentary is necessary for Scripture, or is not. If it is necessary, you and I agree, and cannot disagree, when I assert that private judgment is not the whole guide. It is not necessary for Scripture, why did you use one last night ?

MR. WALKER---commentaries may be *useful*---but *they are not necessary*.

MR. FALVEY,---Mr. Walker is not taking up the argument rightly---he does not take up the dilemma, but flies off from it.

MR. WALKER. I say that taking it in the meaning of indispensable necessity, commentaries are *not* necessary. They may be useful in illustrating things in the Scripture which are not essential. And when we use them, it is in deference to the authority of Scripture, not as paramount to it. When our opponents impugn our position that the Scripture contains all things necessary, without the addition of commentary, for every difficulty which they bring forward as requiring commentary to solve it, they ought in consistency to bring forward an infallible authority from the Church of Rome explaining it.

MR. HENNESSY I am not answered. I repeat my argument and urge it on him. (*Cries---You have got your answer.*)

The Rev. CHAIRMAN---I cannot permit this perpetual infringement of the rule. You have received your answer, and must permit the proceedings to go on.

MR. HENNESSY,---I want to prove that this is not a correct answer. It is but a mockery of discussion, to allow me to propose a question ; and when it is avoided, tell me that I have got my direct answer. I repeat my question, could you answer my question about the change of the name without consulting a commentary.

MR. WALKER---I answer I *could* clear up the difficulty, by a reference to other passages, and the aid of my own private judgment, and if not by my own, I could by the private judgment of another, and it is all the same, the principle is untouched.

The Rev. Mr. WAUGH---I believe the Meeting are satisfied, though this gentleman is not; Mr. Walker has replied distinctly and unequivocally ; but we will settle the business in another manner.

Mr. Swete, as secretary to the Society, on the part of the Clergy of the Established Church, accepts the challenge that has been thrown out by the Rev. Mr. Falvey.

Mr. HENNESSY---If you are not able to confute me, it is useless for you to attempt confuting Mr. Falvey.

Mr. WALKER---It is impossible to confute you, because you cannot understand what is said to you.

Rev. Mr. FALVEY---I have already stated, that it was my intention to have been a silent listener, and I should not perhaps have opened my lips, had I not been called on. When I did make my appearance, I repeated that I did not like the system of argument that was carried on; for in my mind it is not calculated to come to the proof, but to wander for ever in the mazes of error: but that that system of argument which came nearest to the truth, was logical argument, followed up by our adversaries and answered by us. When I spoke this, I also expressed what I felt---that I am not afraid to appear before you, one and all---myself, single and alone---to vindicate my principles. But I deem that it is only when I am called on by my duty to do so, that there is any necessity for me to come forward. For what can any man think of the system of argument carried on by professedly public disputants, when a child is able to put them down? When I say I am ready to enter into a discussion, I stand upon my own authority; for the discipline of my Church does not allow me to bring her doctrines into controversy of my own accord; but if they are impugned in my presence, I am at liberty to defend them. I will now take up in a few syllogisms the argument of the day.

The Rev. Mr. WAUGH said, it was understood by all the gentlemen on the platform, that Mr. Falvey's challenge had reference to a future time; and that he was anxious to enter into a disputation---that he was pledged to one and all, and at any time and place. The duration of their Meeting was nearly concluded, and he wished to know, whether he had misunderstood Mr. Falvey, when he thought he said, he was prepared to meet any or all, at any time or place.

Mr. O'LEARY---This looks like subterfuge. You must have heard Mr. Falvey say, that he was not allowed to bring the doctrine

of his Church into question ; but when they were attacked, he was at liberty to defend them..

The Rev. Mr. WAUGH---Certainly Mr. Chairman; if it had been understood that the challenge was for this moment; as I really did think it was for some future time, it could not have been accepted, according to the rules, in the way that it was. The regulation of the Meeting was, that the Speakers should be heard alternately. Mr. Falvey spoke last--if the Rev. Mr. Falvey now takes possession, the time will be occupied until 4 o'Clock, when we must break up. The understanding of the gentlemen on the platform was, that Mr. Falvey had pledged himself to a future disputation.

Rev. Mr. FALVEY---I am the person in question, and I am best able to explain my own meaning. My name was called, and I am here at the call. As a Clergyman of the Roman Catholic Church, it was not at liberty with me, to appoint a day for the discussion of her tenets; but if I hear them impugned, I am permitted to defend them. This is the only moment I wish I was on that platform, that I might shew my sovereign contempt for these wild--

The Rev. CHAIRMAN---Will you come up on the platform Mr. Falvey? [Mr. Falvey accepted the invitation.]

CAPTAIN GORDON---I beg to observe, that unless we break through the Rule laid down before, the Rev. Mr. Falvey cannot speak after his brother.

Rev. Mr. FALVEY. I am called up here, and then you will not let me speak.

The Rev. CHAIRMAN. A very short time remains for us to finish our proceedings Mr. Falvey; and I beg that you will not occupy more than half an hour.

Rev. Mr. FALVEY. I shall occupy much less time than you imagine Sir. My object in appearing on this platform was, that the words which fell from me should be clearly and distinctly heard and understood by every individual assembled in this Meeting. What I have said, perhaps all did not hear; and you will forgive me therefore if I repeat it. I stated, that I only appeared when my name was mentioned as being present; and when an insinuation was thrown out, that the Roman Catholic Clergy were afraid to appear to vindicate their faith. I stated afterwards, the discipline of my Church,

and I now repeat it, as I find my friends saying that they cannot break through a rule of this Meeting. A rule now made, may be done away to-morrow; but the discipline which commenced 1900 years ago, can never be done away with by me. That discipline prevents any member of the Roman Catholic Church bringing wilfully into dispute, the doctrines which remain on so old and respectable a foundation: but if he is present when they are brought into question, he is at liberty, and is bound in duty to defend them. I am ready now, either with Mr. Gordon, or the Rev. Gentleman before me, to take up the points in dispute between us, and to make him prove, if he can, the consistency of his own principles, or the falsehood of mine. This is the object of my coming before you, and I thank you for your patient hearing.

CAPTAIN GORDON. The Rev. Gentleman has stated his readiness to enter the lists with Mr. Walker or myself---I must say, that such a statement comes at rather a suspicious period, when the Meeting can only last for 35 minutes longer. I have not the least hesitation in saying, that I am ready to meet Mr. Falvey, or any other Roman Catholic Clergyman, and with God's assistance to prove, that their Church is an anti-scriptural Church, and that they themselves are the Priests of an anti-scriptural Church.

Rev. Mr. FALVEY. I will pledge myself to do as much as has been done here in two days, in ten minutes.

CAPTAIN GORDON. It was implied that the discussion was to be at a future time---let it be to-morrow.

Rev. Mr. FALVEY. *I am ready* was the expression.

CAPTAIN GORDON, I began with the observation that the time was nearly expired, and treble what remains of it would not be enough for my purpose, allow sufficient time and I am ready to meet you.

REV. MR. FALVEY, as Mr. Gordon adheres so closely to the regulation of this Meeting, he must allow me to have as much respect for the rules of my religion. I regret that something did not bring me forward at an earlier period; but what is there to prevent the Meeting being extended to 5 o'clock.

REV. MR. WAUGH, darkness.

CAPTAIN GORDON I can't understand on what principle Mr.

Falvey is at liberty to defend his religion now, and not at any other time. If we adjourn to another day, surely you might come in by accident.

The Rev Mr. FALVEY could not consent to this "blinding the D—— in the dark."

The Rev. Mr. WAUGH rose and said---I really think Sir, that it can hardly be necessary at this time of day to tell the world that Protestants have always been anxious to come forward in defence of their religion. It is their decided wish Sir, to meet discussion, conscious that it tends to disseminate truth, to spread the light of Scripture, and to dispel the darkness that has rested on the world for ages.---The lateness of the hour, however, makes it impossible to continue this Meeting much longer at present, and on to-morrow the several Clergymen around me must repair to their respective Parishes, and this House be prepared against the Sunday services---but on any convenient day that shall be fixed, the gentlemen on the platform declare their readiness, to enter fully into this controversy. The Rev. Mr. Falvey says, the discipline of his Church does not allow him to appoint a day for discussion.---I respect Mr. Falvey's talent---His conduct on this occasion commands my respect, and I sincerely regret that he was not here yesterday, as it would have been highly gratifying to have been opposed to a person understanding his own principles, and prepared to defend them, instead of having our time occupied by gentlemen, each of whom bursting with impatience, and apparently dissatisfied with his fellow-labourer, was anxious to remind him that the hand of the clock had gone its appointed round! The conversation that has just taken place Sir, has greatly curtailed the time allotted me, you will therefore, permit me to proceed at once to observe on the outcry that has been raised against the Society, as disturbing the land with its controversies. Peace-loving Protestants should not condemn us; they have been long silent, and to what purpose? Roman Catholics ought not, for they have originated and provoked the contention. I have said Sir, that Protestantism has never shrunk from the avowal and defence of its principles, yet I lament to acknowledge, that the glory of having originated the discussions which have for the last few years taken place in Ireland, does not rest with Protestants. They were quiet, and quiet too long. For

many years Roman Catholics have laboured incessantly and indefatigably, and in some instances successfully in making converts to their system, whilst they avowed and gloried in it. Nor do I attempt Sir, to condemn such conduct, for my firm conviction is, that the man who conscientiously believes he holds the truth as God has revealed it, is bound to endeavour its spread---and I should despise the Roman Catholic Clergyman, who, satisfied that his creed contains pure and unmixed the religion of Jesus Christ, did not by every proper means, by night and by day, strive to extend its influence. This is the right for which we contend, this is the conduct we wish to practice, only let the means be honest, and open, and manly, and Christian, and Scriptural. In proof of my assertion, that the Controversies did not commence with Protestants, I beg to recall to the recollection of many who hear me, the fact, that during a succession of seasons, two persons appeared in the Chapel of Carey's-lane, in this City, one personating a Protestant, and the other a Roman Catholic, to impugn each the other's religion, and defend his own. To be sure the Protestant provided for the occasion was a man of straw---he was under the influence of the mildest and meekest motives, and took care not to bring forward anything too strong or convincing, lest it might irritate and excite unchristian feeling in the breast of his antagonist---I need not say what effect this was calculated to have on the Roman Catholics who witnessed the debate, or what influence it was intended to have on weak and ill-instructed Protestants. Here was controversy with a witness! Yet, notwithstanding the seriousness of this attack, and the hollowness of the defence, Protestants still continued quiet; and if at length *bona fide* Protestants appear, able and willing to defend their own principles, who shall dare to blame them! At last, however, Sir, the spirit of a general opposition to the errors of the Church of Rome was called up, and I will inform the Meeting by what instrumentality; and as in my progress I shall be under the necessity of stating some plain, strong, and perhaps unpleasant truths, I intreat the gentlemen who think differently from me, not to suppose that I mean the slightest insult to their feelings. I appeal to the Roman Catholics who have known me, clergy and laity, whether, at the same time that I have been always ready to avow and defend my opinions, I have ever been inattentive to the kindness and courtesy

of private life? but did I on any such occasion as the present speak by halves, I should disgrace myself, and betray the cause of truth.

The originating cause, Sir, of all our recent controversies, was the memorable attempt made to bolster up, what Protestants may be allowed to call the extraordinary and irrational doctrine of transubstantiation, by the miracles of Hohenlohe. On that doctrine, every thing as connected with priestly power and influence depends, and it was imagined, if such wonders were generally believed, that of course the cause of the Reformation must fall. Still all was comparatively quiet, it being supposed that such clumsy attempts, fit only for the darkest and most besotted times, must call forth the indignation of the heads of the Roman Catholic Church, who would instantly crush them; but when men of acknowledged intellectual rank, and undoubted talent, in the 19th century, so far from being ashamed of the miracle-mongering system, rushed eagerly to its defence, then, and not till then, an energy was called forth, which can only terminate with the overthrow of all that is set in opposition to Christ's Gospel. In addition to this, recourse was had to the arch-infidel, Cobbett. I confess, Sir, I do feel inclined to use strong epithets, in describing the disgraceful connection between a Church professing to be Christian, and William Cobbett! Cobbett, Sir, was the acknowledged instrument of the Church of Rome in maligning with calumnies the grossest and most unfounded that ever entered into a depraved imagination, the doctrines of the Reformed Religion; and the corrupt libel was pushed into the most extensive circulation by an instrumentality with which I am well acquainted, and read by tens of thousands of our misguided population. By such conduct the giant has been aroused! and because Protestantism at length comes forth in all its breadth and brightness, and resting on the firm basis of revelation, proceeds to unbolt the human mind, and unshackle intellect, the keepers of the prison raise the cry of complaint, and indignantly exclaim "why disturb the peace of the nation?" It is the duty and interest of every man to inquire "what is truth?" Much depends on it. By and bye we shall all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, and as we are under the influence of that religion which is the fruit of a Saviour's death, or the contrary, shall the eternal state of each



be one of blessedness or misery. It is therefore, I repeat it, the duty and interest of every man to examine the foundation of his faith, to see on what ground it really rests, and whether it is built on what can alone support him in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment. Every genuine christian has a Gospel hope---a hope founded on the blood and righteousness of the Redeemer---a hope that maketh not ashamed---a hope producing purity; and it is a rational hope; he is prepared to give a reason for it on every proper occasion, though with meekness and fear---I may further venture to assert, Sir, that every man whose heart is thus influenced, who possesses the christian charity that is inseparable from a Gospel hope, must endeavour to extend the influence of what has brought Heaven and happiness to himself. Is it possible that I, for instance, if I possess right feeling, can behold the mass of human beings now before me, without an intense desire, that they all may come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved? It is, Sir, because we believe the spread of what we are assured is truth to be our imperative duty, and because we are anxious for the present and eternal welfare of our Roman Catholic countrymen, that we are found employed as at present---and if we be in error, is it not the duty of those who think so, to endeavour to set us right? but while we mutually engage in this work of charity, in the name of our common Lord, let it be done in the spirit of love, let our Meetings be carried on with friendship and good feeling, that we appear as his followers who said, "hereby shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." In following up its plans, the Reformation Society wishes it to be distinctly understood, that it disclaims all alliance with worldly politics.

MR. CURTAYNE, no politics, Mr. Waugh.

MR. WAUGH, Mr. Curtayne, Sir, dwells so completely in the region of politics, that even to mention the term affects his sensibilities. I was proceeding to observe, that although the individuals composing this Society have doubtless their opinions with regard to matters which must interest every subject of a free Government; yet so far from thinking alike, they differ very widely as to what may or may not be the best policy to pursue with regard to this country. That very fact proves that the Reformation Society

is not to be feared as a political engine, its sole object being to spread the *religious* principles of that Reformation to which the subjects of this realm of every persuasion owe so much. It engages in the dissemination of those principles because of their intrinsic excellence, they being in strict accordance with the word of God. If this Book, Sir, be a revelation from Heaven, it must be worthy of its Author—all that comes from God must be like him, and lead to him. Various non-essential opinions may be held and ceremonies engaged in, as has been ably and eloquently stated by Mr. Walken, of which no mention is made in the Bible---but there is no doctrine held by us, as essential to salvation, which is not explicitly taught in that blessed Book---not one is anti-scriptural---every such doctrine is pure, and leads to purity. We also engage in the dissemination of these principles, because of their antiquity. I was rather astonished, Sir, at the declaration which fell from a gentleman opposed to us, that his is the most ancient religion. I may be permitted perhaps to set my assertion in opposition to his, and to affirm, that *ours* is the most ancient system of Christianity in the world. I have made the assertion wittingly and deliberately; and I pledge myself to prove, whenever it may be necessary to bring forward that proof, that there is not a single doctrine which is received by Protestants as essential, that has not existed since the days of our blessed Lord and his Apostles, and further, *that there is not a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church in which she differs from Protestants, that is not a novelty.* We can mark the date of each; the introduction for instance of transubstantiation, the prohibition of the marriage of the Clergy. [A voice from the crowd, "it is Four o'Clock"] I dare say it approaches it, but I have a few minutes yet. I have said Sir, that there is not a single doctrine in which the Church of Rome differs from Protestant Churches, that is not a novelty, that we can mark the time when each was introduced, the individuals who opposed it, and the awful persecutions which were the fruit of that opposition, and how, and when, it was finally established. Yes Sir, the seas of blood which were shed previous to that period when the reformed escaped from the tyranny and superstition of the Church of Rome, prove the existence of truth throughout those ages---nor do we hesitate to contend, that it is *we* who have an

interrupted succession---the uninterrupted succession of truth! Did time permit, I might easily show how reformation principles promote individual happiness, social enjoyment, and national prosperity. I am aware that the Reformation is charged with producing enthusiastic extravagances, but has the Church of Rome forgotten her Scapular? with being the parent of divisions, but I fearlessly undertake to prove, did time permit me to enter into it at large, that that Church has had as numerous divisions, and at least as bitter contentions, long before the Reformation, as Protestants have had since.

Rev. Mr. FAIVEY. Not concerning doctrine.

Rev. Mr. WAUGH. Yes Sir, concerning both doctrine and discipline---the very subjects on which Protestants disagree---were not the Jesuits opposed to the Jansenists, (an acknowledged part of the Church for a long period) on the doctrine of predestination? and the Franciscans to the Dominicans, on that of the immaculate conception? not to mention an hundred others. The Reformation is further charged with uncertainty, as not having an infallible tribunal. In reply we say, *we have the Bible*, which is at least as infallible and intelligible as the decrees of a thousand Councils! We have been unjustly accused also with samity to notes and comments. I dare venture to affirm that the gentlemen on this platform possess a greater number of commentaries, and make more use of them, than any equal number of Roman Catholics in the land. But in the name of common sense, if it is necessary that there be an infallible interpretation of the word of infallible truth---if the light of God should be made yet more brilliant---why does not the infallible Church in mercy to the souls of her children, furnish an infallible comment? Whether what is in circulation among her members in this country deserves that character, the gentlemen who have called so loudly during the last two days for notes and comments shall judge, when I have read a few notes from their own commentary for them.

Matthew v. 10: "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness sake." This is the text---here is the commentary, "Heretics and other malefactors sometimes suffer, but they are not blessed, because they suffer not for justice."

Matthew XIII. 29, "Nay; lest while you gather up the tares, ye root up the wheat with them, let both grow together until the harvest, &c." Commentary, "The good must tolerate the evil, when

it is so strong that it cannot be suppressed without danger and disturbance of the whole Church; and commit the matter to God's judgment in the latter day; otherwise when ill men (be they heretics or other malefactors) may be punished or repressed without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may, and ought by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, to be chastised or executed."

Matthew xvi. 19, "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven." Commentary, "Which kind of releasing or loosing is called *indulgence*: finally, this *whatsoever* excepteth nothing that is punishable or pardonable by Christ on earth, for he hath committed his power to Peter."

Mark v. 28, "For she said, if I may but touch his clothes, I shall be made whole." Commentary, "He that toucheth the bone of a martyr, receiveth in some degree, holiness of the grace or virtue that is therein."

Luke xiv. 23, "Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in." Commentary, "St. Augustine also referreth this compelling to the penal laws, which Catholic princes do justly use against heretics and schismatics, proving that they who are by their former profession in baptism subject to the Catholic Church, and are departed from the same, after sects, may, and ought to be *compelled* into the unity and society of the Universal Church again—they are to be revoked not only by gentle means, but by just punishment also."

John xix. 17, "And he bearing his Cross, went forth, &c." Commentary, "The Cross had been endowed with the virtue of miracles, both the whole, and every little piece thereof."

Luke ix. 54, 55, 56, "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from Heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did? But he turned and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Commentary "Not justice nor all rigorous punishment of sinners is here forbidden, nor Elias's fact reprehended, for the Church or Christian princes blamed for putting heretics to death." But who are heretics? see Titus iii. 10. Let our Protestants mark all other properties that old heretics ever had, and they shall find all descriptions and marks of an heretic to fall upon themselves."

2 John 10v. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." Commentary, "Every one who believeth not *Transubstantiation* is an heretic—in worldly affairs and secular acts we must avoid them as much as we may; because their familiarity is many ways contri-

The following correspondence took place between the Rev. MR. BEAUFORT, Chairman of the Meeting, and the Rt. Rev. Dr. MURPHY, R. C. Bishop of Cork :—

*January 16th, 1828.*

REVEREND SIR,—As Chairman of the late Meeting in this City, of the Society for promoting the religious principles of the Reformation I am authorised to communicate to you the following Resolution. “The Rev. MR. FALVEY, Roman Catholic Clergyman of Cork, having declared at the Meeting on Thursday, the 10th. instant, that he was able and willing to defend the doctrines of his Church, but was precluded by the discipline of that Church from engaging in controversy, without the permission of his superior; Resolved, that our Chairman be directed to convey to the Right Rev. DOCTOR MURPHY the request of this Society, that he will be pleased to release the Rev. MR. FALVEY from the restriction, and to permit him, or any of his Rev. Brethren, to meet the members of the Society, for the purpose of the discussion by him proposed.”

And to assure you, that your acquiescence in this request will be esteemed a favour very gratifying to the Society.

I have the honour to be, Right Rev. Sir,

Your obedient humble Servant,

W. L. BEAUFORT, Chairman.

The Right Rev. Dr. MURPHY.

*North Chapel Street, January 20, 1828.*

REVEREND SIR,—In the afternoon of the 17th Inst. your communication of the 16th reached me. As Chairman of the Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation, you call upon me to release the Rev. Mr. FALVEY from the discipline of his Church, by which he declared himself precluded from engaging in controversy without the permission of his superiors.

In consequence of the Rev. Mr. FALVEY's absence from town, I have not heard from him, until last night at a late hour, a detail of the circumstances which gave rise to your request. This detail has not produced any alteration in my sentiments respecting the controversial discussions of the day. They are the same which I entertained and acted upon, when solicited upon a former occasion by some of my own Clergy. Convinced from the experience of the last two years that such disputations are practically useless, subversive of Christian Charity, and dangerous to the peace and good order of Society, I feel myself more strongly decided to, refuse my acquiescence in your request.

I have the honour to be, Rev. Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

JOHN MURPHY, R. C. Bishop.

To the Rev. Mr. BEAUFORT.





